DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 412 799 HE 030 567

AUTHOR	Goodale, Thomas G.
TITLE	Alcohol and Drug Abuse. Policy Guidelines for Boards. Campus Life Policy Series.
INSTITUTION	Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY	Hitachi Foundation, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	1992-00-00
NOTE	61p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, One Dupont Circle, Suite 400, Washington, DC 20036; phone: 202-296-8400; fax: 202-223-7053 ($9.95 members, 10 or more, $6.95 each; $13.95 nonmembers, 10 or more $10.95 each).
PUB TYPE	Guides - Non-Classroom (055)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrative Policy; Agency Role; *Alcohol Abuse; Alcohol Education; Budgeting; College Administration; College Environment; College Faculty; College Role; College Students; Costs; *Drug Abuse; Drug Education; *Governance; Governing Boards; Higher Education; Intervention; Legal Problems; Legal Responsibility; Policy Formation; Prevention; Risk; School Personnel; School Policy; *School Responsibility; *Substance Abuse

ABSTRACT

The guide presents facts and issues concerning drug and alcohol abuse so that college and university administration and governing boards can make informed decisions about programs, policy, and procedures to minimize their occurrence on campus. Chapter 1 examines issues related to substance abuse on campus: risk factors in the campus community; the scope of abuse; the costs of abuse; and the institution's responsibility. Chapter 2 looks at various approaches to prevention and intervention, including: elements of successful campus programs; managing the campus environment (sale of alcohol, regulating campus events, alcohol advertising and sponsorship, providing alcohol- and drug-free alternative activities, class scheduling, reducing incidence of mixed messages, penalties and enforcement); development of education programs for students, faculty, and staff; assistance and treatment; and program monitoring. In Chapter 3 the role of the governing board is discussed, focusing on special considerations in policy development (the nature of athletics programs, protecting student and employee rights, nontraditional students, involving the student body, campus-wide coordination); budgeting for education, prevention, and treatment; and the role of the institution as leader, resource, and partner. Guidelines for board response to these issues are presented in Chapter 4. Model alcohol policy guidelines and a list of additional resources are appended. Contains 21 references. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AGB

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

ED 412 799

CAMPUS LIFE
POLICY SERIES

POLICY GUIDELINES
FOR BOARDS

Alcohol and Drug Abuse

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HE 031 563

Alcohol and Drug Abuse

3

BY THOMAS G. GOODALE

1992 Association of Governing Boards
of Universities and Colleges
One Dupont Circle, Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036

All rights reserved
Printed in the United States of America

4

Contents

Foreword v
Acknowledgments vii
Introduction, by James D. McComas ix

CHAPTER 1
Alcohol and Other Substance Abuse on America's College Campuses 1
- Why are Colleges at Risk? 1
- Risk Factors in the University Community 3
- Understanding the Scope of College Substance Abuse 5
- What are the Costs of Alcohol and Other Substance Abuse? 8
- What is the Institution's Responsibility? 10

CHAPTER 2
Approaches to Prevention and Intervention 17
- Preventing Alcohol and Other Substance Abuse 17
- Managing the Campus Environment 20
- Education and Training Programs 24
- Assistance and Treatment Programs 26
- Monitoring and Evaluation 28

CHAPTER 3
Issues and Concerns for Governing Boards 31
- Developing Policies and Programs 31
- Budgeting for Education, Prevention, and Treatment 36
- Colleges and Universities as Leaders, Resources, and Partners 37

CHAPTER 4
Guidelines for a Board's Response 39

References 43

APPENDIX A
Inter-Association Task Force Model Alcohol Policy Guidelines 45

APPENDIX B
Resources for More Information 47

About the Author 51

Titles in the Campus Life Policy Series

Crime on Campus, by Philip Burling
AIDS and HIV, by Richard P. Keeling, M.D.
Alcohol and Drug Abuse, by Thomas G. Goodale
Sexual Harassment and Date Rape, by Bernice R. Sandler

Made possible by a grant from
The Hitachi Foundation

Foreword

Despite broad federal legislation and the efforts of the majority of colleges and universities over the past ten years, alcohol use and abuse remains a pervasive part of the college experience for young people in this country. While the use and abuse of other drugs continues to decline every year among college-aged young people, alcohol use has not diminished at all. Ninety percent of young people (including those who are legally underage) drink in college. Twenty percent drink heavily.

This Special Report discusses the breadth, destructiveness, and high cost of alcohol use and abuse on campuses in America. It proposes a reinvigorated effort by governing boards to provide leadership and to foster lasting change within the campus community. The campus culture must evolve from one that pressures young people to drink into one that rewards responsible use, acknowledges respect for nonuse, and instills the belief that less alcohol means better health, better academic performance, and higher self-esteem.

These are significant attitude and behavior changes. This Special Report offers suggestions for improving policy, an updated summary of legal issues, and innovative, cost-effective program ideas to help governing boards initiate a process of re-evaluation and reconsideration of their institution's existing programs and policies.

While not ignoring the continued campus use of illicit drugs and abuse of prescription drugs, this report concentrates on alcohol, in the belief that alcohol is the drug of choice among our college students. Use and abuse of alcohol is the most problematic and pervasive behavior on college campuses today. Strict law enforcement, campus policies, and changing student attitudes are reducing drug use. Alcohol must now be the focus of renewed campus efforts.

Thomas G. Goodale, author of this report, brings 30 years of practical experience to the task. Currently vice president of student affairs and professor of education at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Goodale is a leading advocate for positive campus reform to reduce alcohol and other substance abuse.

The Association of Governing Boards is grateful to Goodale for offering positive, achievable solutions to this difficult problem and to the Hitachi Foundation of Washington, D.C., for sponsoring this important work. The Hitachi Foundation also has sponsored three other titles in the Campus Life Policy Series: *AIDS and HIV, Sexual Harassment and Date Rape,* and *Crime on Campus.*

Richard T. Ingram
President, AGB
Washington, D.C.

Acknowledgments

For their leadership over the past decade in curbing alcohol and other substance abuse on our nation's campuses, and for their substantial contributions to this book, special thanks go to my colleagues Morris Chafetz, Gerardo Gonzales, and Edward Hammond. To James D. McComas, I owe thanks for his support of and commitment to my work on this important topic. I am indebted to Susan Faraone, for her extensive research and editorial contributions to the book, and to Sharon Richardson, AGB associate editor, for her editorial work.

Many individuals provided information and assistance for this book, including David Anderson, Jonathan Brant, Dr. Margaret Bridwell, and Drew Hunter. The section on legal issues would not have been complete without heavy dependence upon an excellent white paper published by the American Council on Education, titled *Institutional Liability for Alcohol Consumption.* Thanks to Sheldon Steinbach for permission to cite liberally from that document.

Good things are happening because of the efforts of literally thousands of people. Associations like NASPA, BACCHUS, the American College Health Association, and the American College Personnel Association are not only focusing attention on college alcohol abuse, they are coming up with good ideas to deal with the problem. Positive changes are occurring within the alcohol beverage industry, which is becoming more responsive and more responsible in its approach to marketing its products. This is the right time to present an updated set of recommendations to college and university governing boards, and thanks to the foresight of the Association of Governing Boards and the Hitachi Foundation, such a presentation now is possible.

Thomas G. Goodale
Blacksburg, Va.

Introduction

There are rites and rights of maturity. To many, drinking represents both. Drinking also causes some of the most complex, emotional, and destructive problems in American society today. The toll is written, year after year, in family destruction, automobile fatalities and in personal dependencies that often sabotage self-respect and respect for others in the community.

America's young people will not "just say no" to a product that is sold, with the drumbeat of creative advertising, as an elixir of celebration and victory. They are bombarded daily with television and print images that associate alcohol with athletic, social, and sexual success.

The results are, to choose an appropriate term, staggering. An amount of alcohol equal to 600 bottles of beer is consumed annually for every person over 14 in this country. More than 37 percent of high school seniors report "heavy drinking in the past two weeks." On campus, more than 90 percent drink, with some 20 percent continuously falling into the heavy drinking category. Alcohol abuse is a major contributing factor in some 85 percent of student automobile accidents.

To any epidemic, including one of drinking alcohol, there is no one answer. But that fact cannot dissuade colleges and universities from coming up with a series of answers that will make a difference in the lives of students and in the life of this nation. After all, higher education itself is about answers, or at least the pursuit of answers. If a problem is complex, values-laden, and omnipresent, that should provide an incentive for even more effective, creative, and caring debate as part of a responsive, responsible academic mission.

I believe the university can and must be a community of special rights, opportunities and responsibilities. A college or university is not just grades 13 through 17, plus a graduate education "process." Higher education must be "higher" in ways other than in curriculum and in costs. Our standards for diversity, for mutual respect, and for the health of the whole person must reflect vital university-community principles.

It may well be, then, that initiation into the university will become more important than commencement and graduation ceremonies at the end of academic life. For young people and nontraditional students alike, college years can represent a new beginning. It can be a beginning founded on a search for respect, for health, for public service, and for strength of community, in addition to the search for knowledge. The goal of higher education, after all, is to seek understanding that transcends the simple collection of facts.

Understanding is not just a requirement for students. Faculty, administrators, and staff should understand a fundamental point: These students, who seem so self-confident and independent, are often vulnerable, stressed, and just plain scared. Their fears are endemic to their age and to this time in our nation's history (an era dubbed "the age of anxiety" in a recent *Newsweek* cover story). The stress points are many: today's essay, tomorrow's test, next month's exam, a fear of disappointing families, uncertainty about majors and careers, the spectrum of emotions involving sexuality, social acceptance, international tensions, adjusting to an environment of diversity, financial pressures.

From the first day of orientation, a university can aspire to an interest in and an understanding of the whole person—not just in the student's readiness for college algebra. We have a choice to make. We can either be an educational factory, or we can be a student-centered community. The commitment to community, though, cannot be taken lightly. It involves resources of counseling, the inculcation of tradition, the implementation of codes of rights and responsibilities, the reorientation, in some cases, of faculty and administrators, and a clear, viable commitment from the institution's president and governing board.

What kind of world will be our legacy if a significant percentage of the best and brightest of this generation cannot reflect high standards of self-respect, of mental and physical health, and of fundamental judgment about and responsibility for the course of their own lives? Those who believe that concern about drug and alcohol abuse represents "just moralizing" should visit the hospitals and the night-streets of America. And those who do not see alcohol as a societal and university problem should talk to any counselor or law-enforcement officer.

Amid the debate and destruction, there are hopeful signs. This generation is more conscious of physical fitness. Diet and exercise are not viewed as empty gospel from last year's phys. ed. class. Renewed interest in community "fitness" and environmental quality parallels the increased interest in individual health. Student groups have added their voices, especially on the issue of drinking and driving. Alcohol and drug-awareness weeks are now institutional at most universities. The legal implications for universities are becoming more manifest. Like the Olympic torch, ideas for effective answers are passed from campus to campus.

The university community can offer options, in addition to judgments and standards. Expanded physical fitness centers, recreational opportunities, alcohol-free clubs, and drug-free residence halls can all be a part of the answer. Ideas, matched with resources, will make a difference.

Those who reject substance abuse are not "just saying no." They're saying yes to a life of promise and independence. "Tenets of Freedom," and the resources to make them real, can offer compelling guidelines for this nation's colleges and universities. Such tenets, reviewed and promulgated at every level of university governance, could establish the following:

10

■ Every student has a right to freedom from the peer pressure that often results in a pattern of abuse. The university will provide programs and facilities to strengthen this commitment.

■ Freedom encompasses health, and thus physical fitness centers and effective counseling programs will be high priorities.

■ Freedom, in a democracy, means community involvement. The college or university should aspire to be a model for freedom and for the rejection of substance abuse.

■ The university is a community of free individuals. Every student, every faculty member, every staff member is important to the future, the excellence, the image, and the life of this community of opportunity.

■ Every student, every faculty member, and every staff member must understand the individual rights and responsibilities of freedom and of community.

University calendars are divided by sessions and terms, quarters and semesters. We need nothing less, though, than a season of change. That new season must begin now in the colleges and universities of America.

James D. McComas
President
Virginia Polytechnic Institute
and State University

CHAPTER 1
Alcohol and Other Substance Abuse on America's College Campuses

A significant and positive change has occurred on American college and university campuses over the past decade. The use and abuse of illicit drugs has steadily waned since 1980, and most experts believe this trend will continue as a result of more health-conscious societal values and aggressive educational and law-enforcement activities. Alcohol use, however, is a startling exception to this trend. It has steadily remained the drug of choice for American college students, particularly those who are of undergraduate age: 18 to 22 years old. This group, as a whole, spends more money each year on alcohol than on books. College students consume more alcohol and have more alcohol-related problems than their noncollege peers. Alcohol is perceived to be a growing problem among the nation's two-year colleges as well.

It is clear, then, that drug abuse prevention and treatment activities must begin with an understanding of and focus on alcohol abuse, which is by far the most widespread and pernicious substance-abuse problem on the campus today. Alcohol will be the major subject of this publication, with other drugs discussed in the context of an overall policy approach to substance abuse.

Why are colleges at risk?

On the one hand, it is reasonable to assume that college campuses are a microcosm of the larger society. In fact, rather than simply reflecting the consumption habits of the broad base of Americans, college students drink a disproportionate amount. This seems to hold true even though, at most institutions, a substantial percentage of undergraduate students are not of legal age to possess or consume alcohol. There are many reasons for this, and experts do not agree about which are most important. Governing board members working to develop effective and reasonable policies and programs should understand the most widely accepted causes behind the campus alcohol culture.

- **Societal Ambivalence:** Our culture has never been clear about its attitudes toward alcohol. While many of the results of alcohol abuse are reviled, including alcoholism and drunk driving, alcohol is an accepted, even celebrated, part of our culture. There is a sense that college and drinking go together, that both are a rite of passage that young people—particularly young males—go through as a matter of

course. Because it has been an accepted part of the culture for so long, college students tend not to believe that drinking is a problem. To them, it's just a part of campus life.

■ **Traditions and customs emphasize drinking:** Tailgate parties, keg parties, drinking contests, homecoming events, the college bar scene. So many of the traditional social activities of college life incorporate alcohol as the primary ingredient in socializing. While some of these "traditional" activities have been altered on campus with the advent of the 21-year-old drinking age, they have not disappeared by any means. Some simply move off campus, where the institution is less able to provide control and guidance. Laws are easily circumvented by intelligent under-21-year-olds working closely with their over-21 friends.

■ **Alcohol advertising and promotion on campus:** According to a white paper published by the U.S. Office of Substance Abuse Prevention, approximately 35 percent of college newspaper advertising revenue comes from alcohol advertisements (Eigen, 1991). Corporate sponsorship of campus events by alcohol companies reinforces the message that drinking is okay and is a part of the college experience. Then there is the flood of commercial advertising that students are exposed to through the general media on a daily basis—ads that equate alcohol with sexual, athletic, and business success. Marketers spend millions of dollars on these ads and other promotional activities. And they do it because the ads work. While current published research does not explicate the exact results of advertising and sponsorship activities on alcohol consumption among students, the message sent by marketers is that consumption offers a big advantage to young people whose primary concerns are just those: sexual, athletic, and career success.

■ **Colleges and universities are microcosms of the general population:** Most students arriving at residential colleges and universities began their drinking in high school. Students at urban, commuter institutions and two-year colleges reflect the communities from which they come, where the stresses of modern life and the realities of American culture can lead to alcohol and other substance abuse.

■ **Uneven response of college and university administrations:** Alcohol abuse was not taken seriously on most campuses before the early 1960s. And while response to the problem has grown over time, many institutions still do not have comprehensive, effective prevention programs in place. Some are unaware that they have an alcohol problem, especially campuses with a total prohibition of alcohol. The national adoption of the 21-year-old drinking age has made effective policy making even more difficult. A portion of the student population may legally drink, while others may not. Concerns about legal liability have led some administrations to believe that a clearly stated policy would leave an institution open to suit. Finally, the issue of how much responsibility a college has for its (otherwise) adult-age students has made policy development a challenging and divisive issue.

Risk Factors in the University Community

It is clear, then, that many factors in the external environment actively encourage drinking among students. What are their internal motivations? Who drinks the most? Which groups are at the most risk for problems arising from alcohol abuse? While the demography and risk factors are different for each university community, researchers have gathered some basic information that will help governing board members in evaluating programs for their own institutions.

■ **Why do students drink?** The reasons are complex and variable. Research reported in *The Program Administrator's Handbook*, published by the Office of Substance Abuse Prevention (CSR, Inc., 1991b), identified several reasons, which also can be generalized to other drug abuse. For students, drinking may be:

1. A symbolic act of rejecting authority or asserting adulthood;
2. A means of coping with new freedoms and challenges, stresses, frustration, powerlessness, anxiety, depression, boredom, and personal problems;
3. A behavior undertaken for psychosocial reasons, including the enhancement of relaxation, personal confidence, sexual arousal, celebration, and "having fun"; and/or
4. A way to get high or escape.

Peer pressure is particularly powerful in causing young adults to begin drinking alcohol or to increase their alcohol intake when they reach college. In fact, some research shows that the proportion of heavy-drinking students jumps sharply between the senior year in high school to the freshman year of college (Eigen, 1991). So while it is important to realize that alcohol is a problem in high schools and even earlier and that many students arrive at campus already habituated to drinking, the campus culture has a powerful influence on how these young people will develop lifetime habits.

Focus groups with some college students have elicited a widespread response about why they drink: "Because there is nothing else to do!" This is especially common on rural residential campuses.

■ **Men and women face different risks:** Over time, research has shown that college-aged men drink more often and more heavily than college-aged women. While over twice as many male students (3.8 percent) as female students drink daily, 90 percent of both males and females drank alcohol sometime in the previous year (CSR, Inc., 1991b).

Men appear to be at greater risk for suffering alcohol-related problems, including drunkenness, interference with school work, drinking and driving, and drinking-related mishaps. Women, although they drink less heavily, face a different set of risks. Their lower body weight and higher percentage of fat means that it takes less alcohol for them to become impaired. Women are more likely to suffer from dual dependency on alcohol and prescription drugs. Women also risk sexual assault, unwanted

pregnancy, and eating disorders in conjunction with their alcohol use (Burns, Gulland and Rolett, 1988).

■ **African Americans suffer problems later in life:** African-American students drink less and also less often than their white counterparts, with African-American women drinking less than African-American men. Research reported in the Office for Substance Abuse Prevention's white paper, however, indicates that alcohol problem rates increase sharply for African-Americans after their college years and that alcohol problems in middle and old age are much higher in the African-American community. So drinking habits formed in college may be more likely to become drinking problems later in life for this group.

■ **Hispanic men are at particular risk:** Research on Hispanic college students is not available, but general Hispanic populations portray different drinking patterns depending upon their descent. Mexican-American men and women appear to have a higher rate of alcohol-related problems than do Americans of Puerto Rican or Cuban descent (Eigen, 1991). Generally, research shows that Hispanic men have more alcohol-related problems than white or African-American men. This is not true of Hispanic women.

■ **Alcohol has ravaged Native-American cultures:** Native-American populations are the most seriously affected by alcohol. There are significant tribal variations, but overall, the alcohol-related death rate for both men and women is significantly higher than for other population groups (Eigen, 1991). "Alcohol is implicated in three-fourths of all traumatic Native-American deaths. Indians have a high incidence of fetal alcohol syndrome, and three times the overall U.S. rate of death by cirrhosis." (Gibbons, 1992)

■ **Fraternities and sororities:** Quite a bit of information is available to show that fraternity members drink more than the general male college population. They drink more frequently, more heavily, and engage in weekend binge drinking more often. One study noted that fraternity and sorority members had more problems with alcohol than nonmembers, and fraternity-house residents had twice as many problems as apartment-dwelling students and three times as many problems as students in residence halls (CSR, Inc., 1991b).

■ **Adult children of alcoholics:** Up to 10 percent of the college student population at any one time may fall into this category. Not only are these students at greater risk of becoming alcoholic than the general population, but they also tend to arrive at the university with a range of other problems stemming from the family dysfunction created by alcoholism, including alcohol abuse, learning disabilities, and low self-esteem (Eigen, 1991).

■ **Gay, lesbian, and bisexual students** have more problems with alcohol than the general student population. They are dealing with guilt, shame, and worry in addition to the normal stresses of college life. Their alcohol use also can expose them to a higher risk of unprotected sexual activity and AIDS.

■ **Part-time and commuting students:** Squeezing in class and study time around full-time job and family responsibilities, part-time students may drink to cope with the stress of overcrowded and overdemanding daily lives. Commuting students who do not live with parents or other responsible adults are at risk because they have neither a supportive home environment nor campus community support. Because these groups spend less time on campus, educational programs must be specially crafted to reach them.

■ **Faculty and staff:** Faculty and staff members also suffer from alcohol and drug abuse. Employees may operate under intensive stress, at home or at work. The flexibility in faculty members' work schedules can make it very difficult to detect an alcohol or other drug problem. As in any organization, employee dependencies and abuse can result in absence from work, erratic job performance, safety hazards, impaired productivity, racial and sexual harassment of students or colleagues, and resentment among coworkers. Abuse costs institutions of higher education millions of dollars each year in lost productivity, administrative and supervisory time, and in increased medical insurance and workman's compensation costs.

Understanding the Scope of College Substance Abuse

■ **How much is too much?**

Drinking alcohol is a widespread activity on the average college campus. Around 90 percent of all students say they drink. College students drink on average 34 gallons of beer per year (Eigen, 1991). What do these figures mean about the actual incidence of alcohol abuse on campus?

More telling are the data on heavy drinking. Among the general college population, daily drinkers are only 3.8 percent, a percentage that has gone down from 6.5 percent in 1980. However, a full 41 percent of college students reported having five or more drinks in a row in the past two weeks (CSR, Inc.,1991b). This is enough to get drunk, to cause impairment of judgment and coordination, to cause automobile and all other manner of accidents, and to encourage vandalism, crime, and sexual assault. According to Joseph M. Fischer, in an article in the monograph *Alcohol Policies and Practices on College and University Campuses* (Sherwood, 1987), ". . . the problems of alcohol abuse and alcoholism show no signs of slowing down among our nation's youth. Rather . . . these problems are assuming epidemic proportions in America and are increasing more rapidly among college students than among other groups of young people."

The number of students who drink to get drunk has gone up since the 1970s. In 1989, twice as many men and three times as many women said they drink to get intoxicated as did a group of their peers in 1977 (Cage, 1992).

Heavy drinking also tends to be related to other substance abuse. Heavy drinkers are more likely to use other illicit drugs, either separately or in combination with alcohol. Alcohol is viewed by some experts as a "gateway drug," which can lead to use of illicit drugs.

Abuse of other substances, though continuing to abate among college students, should not be ignored. Research shows that in 1990 14 percent of students used marijuana in the past 30 days, 1.1 percent used LSD, 1.2 percent used cocaine, and 1.4 percent used some sort of stimulant. Seven percent used sedatives or tranquilizers in the last 30 days (CSR, Inc., 1991b).

■ Alcoholism and Alcohol Abuse

Alcoholism and alcohol abuse are distinct problems, but they are hard to differentiate in their early stages. While the majority of this discussion has subsumed alcoholism under the general rubric of alcohol abuse, education and treatment programs need different approaches to be effective in dealing with these separate alcohol-related syndromes.

Alcohol abuse can be described as the abusive consumption of alcohol to deal with stress or other life problems. Fischer's working definition for the college campus (Fischer, 1987) is that student alcohol abuse is present when the student's continued use of alcohol creates problems in any part of his or her academic career.

Alcoholism is a physical, addictive reaction to alcohol. Research has shown that it is a hereditary condition, caused by the body's failure to metabolize alcohol properly. The health establishment now regards it as a physical illness, albeit one that results in psychological and other problems. An individual has a 50 percent chance of becoming an alcoholic if one of his or her parents was alcoholic, and an even greater chance if both parents were alcoholic (Fischer,1987).

Up to 10 percent of the university population—some 1 million students—are genetically predisposed to becoming alcoholics (Eigen, 1991). A larger percentage of the student population (up to 40 percent) engages in abusive heavy or binge drinking. These are significant numbers, particularly in light of the fact that drinking alcohol is theoretically "off limits" to a substantial number of undergraduates because they are underage.

■ Student Attitudes Toward Drinking

Students know what's going on with alcohol and drugs on the campus. But for the most part, they accept the guidelines supplied by the prevailing campus culture and by their peers, and they resist regulation concerning alcohol use, which they interpret as being unfair and even hypocritical.

College students seem to be aware of the dangers of daily drinking. Very few (3.8 percent in 1990) report that they engage in this activity. The great majority see great risk in daily drinking and even more disapprove of drinking every day. However, only 18 percent disapproved of trying one or two drinks, and less than half saw great risk in having five or more drinks once or twice each weekend (Eigen, 1991). It appears that heavy weekend drinking is perceived as being much less risky than steady, daily drinking.

Other research may support the incidence of binge drinking as a common behavior. One study showed that the number of students who believe that most of

their friends get drunk once a week was 24 percent, a percentage that has gone up over time, while the percentage of students perceiving that most of their friends use marijuana and cocaine has gone down (Eigen, 1991).

American society's ambivalence about alcohol is not lost on the best and brightest of its young people. Students between the ages of 18 and 21 are considered adults in every aspect of their lives but this one—the ability to purchase and consume alcohol. The messages they receive on campus can be highly contradictory. On the one hand, they hear about the dangers and risks of alcohol use and abuse. On the other hand, they watch prominent alumni precede each and every football game with tailgate parties featuring alcohol. Students are invited to faculty, department, or college gatherings at which their role models—older students and faculty—are drinking. One study showed that students supported the 21-year-old drinking age for others but personally ignored the law in their own drinking practice (Engs and Hanson, 1987).

A slim majority of students seem to be aware that alcohol creates problems. When asked in a Gallup poll to rate their view of the seriousness of alcohol abuse problems on campus, 14 percent said that there was a serious problem and 39 percent perceived somewhat of a problem. Thirty-two percent reported not much of a problem, and 15 percent saw no problem or had no opinion (CSR, Inc., 1991b). However, this does not measure their acceptance for alcohol "use," only their concern about alcohol "abuse."

■ **When, What, and Where do Students Drink?**

Students do most of their drinking on evenings and weekends. Reportedly, between 53 percent and 84 percent of college students get drunk once a year, and between 26 percent and 48 percent get drunk once a month or more (Eigen, 1991). Seventy-five percent of college students drank in the last 30 days, and 41 percent had five or more drinks in a row within the last two weeks (CSR, Inc., 1991b).

Over the last 30 years, beer has been the preferred alcoholic beverage for males, both in the general population and in college settings. Women's tastes appear to be changing over time from a distinct preference for spirits, to a preference for wine or beer, depending upon the locale of the study (Engs and Hanson, 1987).

Students will drink in many and varied locations, on and off campus. Most drinking is centered around formal and informal social activities. Certainly the policies and laws of each state and campus affect when and where drinking takes place. Men are more likely to drink in single-sex groups in a variety of social environments, including athletic events, in dorms, and at concerts. Women apparently prefer more structured situations (restaurants, clubs) and drink more often in mixed-sex groups (Engs and Hanson, 1987). Fraternities are certainly a location for drinking, and research also indicates that rural colleges and universities may have higher rates of drinking than urban institutions, indicating that drinking is one of only a few entertainments these students believe is available to them (Eigen, 1991).

Changes in the drinking age do not seem to have significantly altered the amount of alcohol consumption among college students. Prohibition of alcohol on the campus in response to the higher drinking age, and to other legal liability risks, does not solve the problem. It merely moves the drinking to other locations.

What are the Costs of Alcohol and Other Substance Abuse?

The risks and tragic consequences of illicit drug use are well known, with the deaths of college athletes like Len Bias serving to focus national attention on the dangers of drug use. Alcohol's dangers are more insidious—precisely because they tend not to be so dramatic. Thus, while Americans (including college students) are turning away from drugs like marijuana and cocaine in growing numbers, their use of alcohol continues unabated. The costs of consumption, and the resulting alcohol abuse, are staggering. To cite just one example, administrators of 200 colleges and universities estimated in 1988 that alcohol is involved in 68 percent of violent behavior and 52 percent of physical injuries on their campuses (CSR, Inc., 1991b).

Universities, their students, faculty, and staff, are paying a high price, in short-term and long-term physical and emotional health problems, poor academic performance, growing campus crime, and drained university financial resources. Governing board members need to determine the true costs of alcohol and other substance use and abuse on their campuses in order to develop appropriate policies and programs and to budget sufficient funds to make these programs effective.

The three companion Special Reports in this series, *AIDS and HIV, Sexual Harassment and Date Rape,* and *Crime on Campus,* all contain information about the effect of alcohol and drug abuse on these problems.

■ Physical and Emotional Health Problems

"Of the college students currently enrolled in the United States, approximately the same number will eventually die from alcohol-related causes as will get master's degrees and doctorates combined" (CSR, Inc., 1991b).

This startling assessment, based on overall U.S. alcohol-related mortality figures, includes both the short-term and long-term results of alcohol consumption—not necessarily alcohol abuse. Alcohol abusers and alcoholics are not the only victims of alcohol-related death. The greatest immediate risk to students is death in an alcohol-related traffic accident. Drownings, fatal falls, and other campus mishaps are primarily alcohol-related. Rapid ingestion of alcohol, usually in the context of drinking games and fraternity hazing, is another cause of death. In fact, 9 of 10 fraternity/sorority hazing fatalities involve alcohol (Eigen, 1991).

Alcohol impairs judgment and lowers inhibitions. Any individual is at greater risk of accidental death when under the influence of alcohol. Accidental death can also result from the combination of alcohol with barbiturates or other substances.

Alcohol is certainly a factor in all manner of nonfatal mishaps, accidents, and injuries, although it is difficult to measure how many. A survey of junior, technical,

and community colleges revealed that administrators believed alcohol was involved in self-injury 43 percent of the time and injury to others 46 percent of the time (Anderson and Pressley, 1991). Medical personnel at student health centers should be able to provide data for individual institutions. Students also are more likely to engage in unplanned and unprotected sexual activity—exposing women to unwanted pregnancies and both sexes to AIDS. Women risk exposing their unborn children to Fetal Alcohol Syndrome (FAS).

Drinking habits formed or consolidated in college will continue for many years in some individuals. Long-term results of continued alcohol abuse include cirrhosis of the liver, a variety of cancers, and possibly hypertension and coronary heart disease.

Mental and emotional health can be damaged by alcohol, with serious consequences for the university community. Adult children of alcoholics are much more likely than others to arrive at college with emotional difficulties and learning disabilities that require assistance. Alcohol can lead to difficulties in emotional relationships —a key area of concern and importance to college-aged young people. Alcohol is a depressant and may lead otherwise troubled individuals to consider or even attempt suicide.

■ **Poor Academic Performance**

Alcohol unquestionably has a deleterious effect on the academic performance of many students—whether or not they can be classified as alcohol abusers. According to the Office of Substance Abuse Prevention's 1991 white paper, "Human memory is particularly susceptible to disruption by acute doses of alcohol. Blood Alcohol Concentration (BAC) correlates with the extent of the amnesia. A BAC as low as .04 grams per milliliter alters memory functions, and memory impairment gets worse as the BAC increases. A BAC of .04 is far less than that of many students on a typical American campus each Saturday night and less than the .10 level that defines legal intoxication in most states. Such effects can obviously impair school performance and retention."

One survey of college officials revealed that they believe alcohol to be a factor in 40.8 percent of all academic problems and in 28.3 percent of dropouts (Eigen, 1991). Some 7 percent of freshmen drop out each year for alcohol-related reasons (CSR, Inc., 1991b). This figure doesn't include the students who manage to pass all their courses, but who don't learn or retain as much as they could, or who don't perform as well as they might. Many studies have been conducted that correlate better academic performance with lower alcohol consumption. Given that the primary reason for students to attend college is to learn, alcohol in this regard seems to be clearly incompatible with the goals of the institution.

■ **Campus Crime and Violence**

Not all campus crime and violence is caused by alcohol, obviously. Some percentage of these incidents have no relation to alcohol use, and some are caused by

individuals using illicit drugs. But many incidents are attributed to alcohol, including thefts, assaults, vandalism, and sexual assault (including acquaintance rape, currently a major concern on many campuses).

One university kept track of some alcohol-related crime and found that 7 percent of its undergraduates had stolen something after drinking, 7 percent had been in fights, and 10 percent had committed acts of vandalism after drinking. As much as two-thirds of campus vandalism may be alcohol-related (Eigen, 1991). Drinking also increases an individual's chances of being the victim of a crime.

■ **Economic Burden on the College or University Community**

Each institution should attempt to assess the costs of alcohol and other substance abuse on its campus and in its community. Economic consequences are clear for students who fail or drop out of college because of substance abuse. They will suffer a dramatic difference in their ability to earn income—not to mention the health costs that may result if their alcohol abuse continues.

The direct costs to the university include property damage and loss from theft and vandalism and increased security costs to maintain a safe campus for students. Student health problems influence the costs of running student health centers. Faculty and employee health problems directly impinge on productivity and health insurance costs.

Not counted in dollars is the cost to a college or university that develops a reputation for being a "party school." It is difficult to know how such a reputation influences the decisions of students in choosing a college or university, the decisions of parents in letting their children attend a certain institution, the decisions of prominent faculty in joining an institution.

Finally, there is the specter of litigation, which could add up to substantial costs if an institution is found liable in a suit and which raises the overall operational costs of the institution as an ongoing element of its risk-management program.

What is the Institution's Responsibility?

While legal considerations have a substantial effect on the development of comprehensive alcohol and substance-abuse policies on campus, governing boards must also determine their commitment to a broader responsibility to their students, their employees, and the community at large.

Legal Responsibility

This discussion is indebted to a white paper developed by the American Council on Education (ACE) titled, "Institutional Liability for Alcohol Consumption." For information on how to obtain copies of the ACE publication, see Appendix B: Resources for More Information.

Federal legislation now requires all colleges and universities receiving federal funds, including guaranteed student loans, to adopt and implement alcohol and drug policies, along with prevention programs. In addition, tort liability has been

broadening in the past several years in cases where alcohol and drug abuse have caused injury to individuals or to third parties.

Cases that have come from the courts in the last decade seem to indicate that the best protection for an institution is a comprehensive, reasonable, and enforceable policy—one that is clearly communicated through an educational program to all students, faculty, and staff. "Reasonable" and "enforceable" are key concepts here. In fact, ACE recommends that it is poor practice for a school to promulgate a strict set of regulations that it will not or cannot enforce, just to please parents, alumni, or federal officials with a tough-sounding policy. Unenforced or unenforceable rules may come back to haunt an institution if a court or jury regards the rules as establishing a standard of student conduct that the school itself has failed to maintain.

Each institution must work with its legal counsel to determine the impact of the most up-to-date decisions on these issues, as well as the effect of rapidly changing federal, state, and local laws. The discussion here is a brief summary to introduce the key issues involved.

■ The College or University's Limited Role as Supervisor of Student Conduct

Leading cases in this area indicate that although colleges and universities do not have the duty to control the private conduct of their students, they do have a "duty of care" that requires them to provide due warning where there is clear and present danger and to ensure that the institution's activities, offerings, and programs meet minimum standards of care for their students.

Although some recent decisions indicate an ambivalence about whether college students are responsible adults (particularly where alcohol use by under-21-year-olds is concerned), the ACE white paper recommends that universities consider an approach suggested by cases that have rejected *in loco parentis*, judging that students are adults who are responsible for their own conduct. An institution's duty to care can be shown if it adopts a comprehensive, reasonable policy, clearly communicates the policy, and enforces the policy in a fair and consistent manner. Concrete recommendations are that the institution do the following:

- Recognize explicitly that students are adults and are expected to obey the law and take personal responsibility for their conduct.
- Acknowledge that the institution will neither police the personal lives of the students on or off campus nor invade their privacy by spying or intrusive search.
- Caution that students will be disciplined if their use of alcohol or drugs threatens disorder, public disturbances, danger to themselves and others, or property damage.
- Warn that the university will impose sanctions when illegal use of alcohol or drugs comes to its attention.
- Enforce all policies consistently.

■ Consider establishing education and counseling programs addressing responsible use of alcohol and the hazards of alcohol and drug abuse.

■ **The University as Proprietor**

As a property owner, the university is responsible for maintaining safe premises for those who come to the premises to live, work, or engage in other legitimate activities. Where alcohol and drug abuse is concerned, universities need to understand how to demonstrate that they have exercised their duty to maintain safe premises for students and employees in the case of alcohol or drug-related incidents.

The ACE analysis concludes that the chief concern of the institution as proprietor should be in coping with hazardous situations on the campus rather than policing private student drinking or drug abuse on campus. Recommendations are for the institution to "identify and respond quickly to disorderly situations, anticipate recurring patterns of rowdiness with heightened security, and take steps to prevent repeated misconduct by particular individuals or groups."

■ **The University as Seller of Alcohol**

This issue is subject to numerous variations in state and local laws. Most states have passed dramshop acts, which make it a crime for a licensed vendor to sell alcohol to a minor or to an already intoxicated person. In addition, some states, either through legislation or court interpretation, also impose civil liability on the seller for any injury to a third party that results from the prohibited purchaser's conduct.

Because the national drinking age is now 21, and the undergraduate population is split between legal and illegal purchasers, universities must be more vigilant in this regard. Many universities have stopped the on-campus sale of all alcohol for this very reason, although some have chosen to use licensed outside service vendors to provide alcoholic beverages at campus functions.

Different state laws may affect whether the university might be responsible for the sales of beverages by other university-related organizations, including fraternities, sororities, clubs, and associations. Some dramshop acts also impose civil liability upon the owner of a premises in which alcoholic beverages are inappropriately sold (Fenili, 1987).

The ACE analysis recommends that institutions take a number of steps:

1. Be familiar with state and local laws governing those who sell alcoholic beverages.

2. Scrupulously follow local alcoholic beverage control laws—refrain from serving anyone who appears even slightly intoxicated and require reliable proof that each customer is of legal age.

3. Advise campus organizations of the potential liabilities under dramshop statutes, as well as the licensing and other requirements governing sales of alcoholic beverages.

■ **The University as Social Host**

More troubling and difficult to deal with is the trend in some states and courts to extend dramshop liabilities to social hosts who serve alcohol to minors or intoxicated persons. Again, the institution should clearly understand and closely monitor state and local law as it applies to this issue.

The university is likely to be considered a social-host when it or its agents serve alcohol at events such as receptions and departmental gatherings. While the concern for serving minors is obvious, even gatherings of faculty or staff in which no minors are present could be cause for concern, if an intoxicated person is served and then causes third-party injury. According to ACE, the institution may also be regarded as social host if drinks are served during seminars in professors' homes or at athletic awards banquets and similar events.

An evolving climate makes it more difficult to generalize recommendations in this area, but the ACE analysis notes that in most states, colleges and universities may still exercise reasonable care and avoid liability by requiring those who serve beverages to check identifications and refuse to serve those who appear intoxicated.

■ **Drug-Abuse Issues**

While the university does not have the duty to police or control the private conduct of its students, the duty of care and the duty to maintain safe premises by preventing foreseeable, dangerous conduct apply to drug abuse as well as alcohol. In particular, universities may be charged with negligence for their students' use of drugs in connection with athletic programs or treatment by student health-center professionals. Actions of university employees or agents may also expose the university to liability as a seller or provider of drugs.

It is recommended that institutions do the following:

1. Review their regulations concerning student and employee conduct to ensure that they are realistic, enforceable, and conscientiously followed.

2. Monitor health-care programs to make sure that agents of the university are not unwittingly aiding drug abuse.

3. Train counselors, security personnel, and health-care professionals to recognize and properly respond to signs of drug abuse.

4. Strictly forbid any use of performance-enhancing drugs or the use of any drugs (e.g., painkillers, steroids) for purposes other than providing the best medical care to a student.

Some universities have instituted drug testing in their athletic programs to control drug use and abuse by athletes, but these programs have legal risks of their own. Institutions should work closely with legal counsel and other experts in the field when considering implementing such programs.

■ **Federal Legislation**

Many of the activities recommended by ACE to provide an institution with defense against liability have become required for institutions receiving federal funds

through the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act Amendments of 1989 and the Drug-Free Workplace Act of 1988. Gerardo M. Gonzalez, a nationally recognized expert on alcohol and other substance abuse on campus, discussed the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act and its requirements in a recent paper (Gonzales, 1991). This section is principally based on his paper. The Drug-Free Workplace Act makes similar requirements and is applicable to recipients of federal grants (including students receiving Pell Grants) and contracts.

As in the case of alcohol, colleges and universities should have no duty *in loco parentis* to police their students' private use of illegal drugs. However, colleges and universities that receive federal funds have a duty under current law to inform all students receiving federal financial aid that they must be drug-free to remain eligible for such aid. The same applies to contractors and grant recipients under the Drug-Free Workplace Act.

Moreover, the institutions themselves must certify that they comply with the provisions of both pieces of legislation. The language requires each institution to certify that "it has adopted and implemented a program to prevent the illicit use of drugs and the abuse of alcohol by students and employees." Such a program, at a minimum, must include the annual distribution of the following to each student and employee:

1. Standards of conduct that clearly prohibit the unlawful manufacture, possession, use, or distribution of drugs and alcohol by students and employees on the institution's property or as any part of the institution's activities;

2. A description of the applicable legal sanctions under local, state, and federal law for unlawful possession, use, or distribution of illicit drugs and alcohol;

3. A description of the health risks associated with the use of illicit drugs and the abuse of alcohol;

4. A description of any drug and alcohol counseling, treatment, or rehabilitation programs that are available to students and employees; and

5. A clear statement that the institution will impose sanctions on students and employees (consistent with local, state, and federal law) and a description of these sanctions, up to and including expulsion or termination of employment, required participation in an approved rehabilitation program, and referral for prosecution for violations of the standards of conduct.

The law further requires an institution of higher education to conduct a biennial review of its program to (a) determine its effectiveness and implement changes if they are needed, (b) ensure that the sanctions developed are consistently enforced, and (c) provide a copy of the program to the U.S. secretary of education upon request. Violation of these federal laws could not only result in the loss of federal funds, but also potentially may lead to liability judgments in cases where the institution fails to make accessible appropriate information or programs.

According to ACE, it is important that colleges understand what the laws do *not* require, as well as what they demand. Colleges are *not* required to assume new obli-

gations to protect students from their own use of illicit drugs or abuse of alcohol or to protect students or third parties from the actions of students using drugs or alcohol. Schools must take care that their programs do not unintentionally assume unwanted additional duties or infringe on their students' and employees' rights to privacy and due process.

Moral Responsibility

As with all social issues, alcohol and other drug use creates dilemmas for those hoping to craft the best policies and programs. How much education is enough? How much regulation is too much? Are individual rights of privacy protected? Is the community's right to safety and security protected? Are students mature enough to bear the responsibility of decision making in this area? If not, how much assistance do they need, and how much can the university reasonably be expected to accomplish? How much can the university afford?

Governing board members will have different opinions about all of these difficult issues. But they clearly must accept the fact that alcohol and drug abuse are a menace to the goals of all institutions of higher learning. Colleges and universities exist to educate, to conduct research, to contribute to the well-being and quality of life in our society. To fulfill these missions, institutions need to provide a healthy, low-risk environment for students and employees, to educate students so they can make safe and responsible decisions about alcohol and drug use, and to offer humane and effective counseling and treatment programs for all members of the campus community who need them.

Effective prevention programs need ongoing leadership, attention, and funding to succeed. Governing boards can work with administrators, faculty, and student and community leaders to fight these battles. Leadership and courage are needed at the very top—governing boards are uniquely qualified to provide both.

CHAPTER 2
Approaches to Prevention and Intervention

Each institution has its own culture, character, and traditions. Governing board members should realize that effective programs and policies are based on a thorough understanding of the unique circumstances on each campus and on the institution's willingness to work with all members of the university community to devise creative, comprehensive solutions.

Successful alcohol and drug-prevention programs seem to share certain characteristics. As governing boards direct, review, and monitor program development, it is worth keeping these factors in mind. Programs that work best have the following:

- Support from the top.
- A commitment to the eventual institutionalization of the program.
- Shared ownership between academic affairs, student affairs, and other key campus constituencies.
- Emphasis on gaining high visibility on campus and in the surrounding community.
- A prevention program staff with a good mix of competencies, including marketing, communications, and management skills as well as up-to-date knowledge about substance-abuse prevention education.
- A nonthreatening program approach that stresses individual responsibility and decision making and alternatives to alcohol and drugs.
- A prevention focus fitted to the individual campus.
- Organizational credibility and competent administration (Coughlin and Mills-Novoa, 1992).

This chapter reviews different approaches institutions have explored, in an effort to provide governing board members with a base of knowledge with which to approach the problem.

Preventing Alcohol and Other Substance Abuse

■ Agreeing on a specific program goal

Colleges should clearly define the ultimate goal of any prevention program to achieve maximum success. Whether reviewing a current set of programs and policies or developing them for the first time, board members must ask critical questions:

1. Do the policies and programs go as far as they can?

2. Do they need to be strengthened?
3. Do they document administrative awareness of concern?
4. Do they include reasonable strategies and sound support systems?

There are several possible goals for any institution to consider.

Prohibition: This is the appropriate goal for drug-prevention programs. Not only is it required by law, but society at large and the majority of college students agree that abuse of illicit or prescription drugs is clearly harmful. In fact, the continued downward trend in drug use on campus seems to indicate that current public and university policies and prevention efforts are working. However, drug use continues on most campuses, and any comprehensive alcohol and drug-prevention program must continue to provide education and support to students to help them avoid the dangers of drug abuse.

A program whose goal is no use of alcohol may appear tempting because of its simplicity. In fact, it is the only plausible approach for institutions with religious or traditional bans on the use of alcohol. But such institutions must understand that prohibiting alcohol use on campus does not stop all students from using alcohol. Use goes underground or off campus. Individuals who are abusers will still experience alcohol-related problems. In addition, strong penalties for such use may well increase denial among students, faculty, or staff with problems and may keep them from seeking the help they need.

So universities that develop "no use" policies should still implement education, support, and rehabilitation programs and strive to create an atmosphere on campus that is humane, not unforgiving.

Morris Chafetz, formerly director of the National Institute on Alcoholism and Alcohol Abuse, has advice for governing boards considering a "just say no" alcohol policy for their campuses: "College administrators must respond to the reality of their circumstances. Thus, to design a restrictive plan that has little opportunity for success is like hiding one's head in the sand to avoid seeing the chaotic behavior that would ensue. While neither condoning nor encouraging consumption for those under (or over) 21, careful planning of specific steps must provide guidelines for campus circumstances where alcohol may be consumed."

Responsible use: This is the most prevalent approach on college campuses today, one that emphasizes education and personal responsibility on the part of students, staff, and faculty to understand the results of alcohol use and to make their decisions about use in a socially responsible fashion. A responsible-use prevention program is a realistic, reasonable, enforceable program of the type recommended by the American Council on Education to show a "duty of care" for legal purposes.

This approach, however, has its critics. First, if a responsible-use program is based solely on educational efforts—such as freshman orientation workshops, flyers passed out to the campus community, or courses on alcohol abuse—research shows that it may not be successful. Education has been shown to positively affect *knowledge*

where alcohol is concerned, but it apparently does not have much affect on *behavior.* Some experts believe that "responsible use" simply continues to send mixed messages to young people about whether alcohol use is acceptable. Also, there is no such thing as "responsible drinking" for those who are alcoholics or alcohol abusers.

Responsible-use programs are helpful but not necessarily sufficient. "There must also be initiatives on campus to alter significantly the alcohol culture and environment and reduce the amount of alcohol that is consumed. This does not necessarily mean requiring abstinence of all students in general or on particular occasions. It does mean making sure that there is a culture and atmosphere that realistically support and allow abstinence on the part of those students who prefer it or for those who should be abstinent as a result of past personal history" (Eigen, 1991).

Changing the campus culture to reduce alcohol use: This goal takes alcohol policies and programs one step further. It acknowledges the university's assumption of responsibility to influence permanent, long-term change in the campus alcohol culture and in the behavior of students, faculty, and staff. This goal is being set at colleges and universities around the country, but it can only be achieved with the full commitment, leadership, and support of governing boards and administrations. A comprehensive approach that comprises education, staff training, campus regulation, and ongoing reinforcement, changing the campus culture has the potential to provide tremendous benefits to the university and to its students.

■ **Elements of a comprehensive prevention program**

Whatever goal is adopted by the institution, it will be most effectively achieved if it includes assessment of the current situation, management of the environment, education and training programs, intervention and treatment programs, and a plan for ongoing monitoring and evaluation.

Assessing the situation:

The board will need accurate data about the extent and character of alcohol and other drug use in its campus community. Understanding the problem as it exists on an individual campus is critical for achieving and evaluating overall program success. Such an assessment will include the following:

1. A survey of students, staff, and faculty to determine levels of use, reasons for use, times and places of use, knowledge about and attitudes toward alcohol and other substances, and knowledge about treatment and support programs available.

2 A review of security, local police, and student health-service records for anonymous data on alcohol and drug-related crime and health problems.

3. Information from campus security and local police on the type and availability of alcohol and drugs on campus and in the local community.

4. A review of anonymous data from employee-assistance programs and student-counseling programs on the number of people using their services.

5. A review of the monetary value and effect of alcohol advertising, sponsorship, and other marketing activities on campus.

This information can be gathered by qualified individuals in the university community, by a task force appointed for that purpose, or by an outside consultant. However the assessment is done, it is important for governing board members (and college administrators) to face the facts the research reveals and not to ignore or hide them because of concerns about the institution's public image. In the long run, colleges and universities that face and deal with the problem of alcohol and other substance abuse will get credit for their efforts. Ignoring any problem that exists will not make it go away. In addition, if alcohol is a problem on campus, it is likely that students (if not their parents), faculty, and the local community already know that it exists.

Strategies for achieving prevention goals: Prevention programs pursue some combination of two key strategies to achieve their goals. The first is to *modify distribution* to reduce the supply of alcohol and other drugs. Making the possession and sale of certain substances illegal is one way to reduce supply. Colleges and universities can also consider a number of other actions to reduce the supply of alcohol on campus. These activities are limited by their very nature to within the campus boundaries. However, the institution can also work with local agencies, state ABC boards and local bar owners to achieve communitywide availability of alcohol.

So the second strategy is to *modify behavior* in an attempt to reduce demand. Positive aspects of this strategy include education and peer-group support programs. In addition, imposing penalties for the use and abuse of alcohol and other drugs is another activity intended to modify behavior. Effective behavior-modification techniques have the advantage of extending beyond the boundaries of the campus—in fact, they may change individual behavior for a lifetime.

Managing the Campus Environment

Because this clearly falls within the purview of policy making, governing boards may first wish to examine how best to control the supply of alcohol on the campus. For this purpose, the board must review and understand the legal extent of the campus per se. How will regulations about campus social events apply to fraternities and sororities, for example? What about faculty holding university or classroom-related events in their homes? What about students in off-campus housing?

Second, it is critical that once policies and regulations are developed they are enforced clearly and consistently, across the board. A poorly enforced alcohol policy may be as bad as no policy at all.

Campus sale of alcohol: If alcohol is to be sold on campus, should it be restricted to certain areas? Despite growing concerns about legal risks that have caused many institutions to close down their on-campus pubs, one advantage to maintaining an on-campus setting is that it provides an environment that encourages responsible drinking, where the university can exercise more control and care for its students. Employing trained servers, for example, has proved to reduce alcohol consumption,

because these individuals have learned to recognize the signs of intoxication and know how to handle people who have drunk too much.

If the university sells alcohol, it must be strict in enforcing laws against serving underage or intoxicated individuals. Also, on-campus bars should not be allowed to sponsor drinking games or contests, "all you can drink" activities, or cut-rate specials on drinks.

Regulating campus events: Seventy-five percent of four-year colleges and universities allow the consumption of beer on campus; 68 percent allow hard liquor (Anderson and Gadaleto, 1991). Only 21 percent of two-year colleges permit alcohol to be served (Anderson and Pressley, 1991). If alcohol is allowed to be served at college events, a number of regulations can reduce the amount of alcohol consumed and to make it "all right" for individuals who don't want to drink. Here are some ideas to consider:

1. Require advance registration for events at which alcohol is to be served, so that consumption can be monitored by university officials.
2. Require that nonalcoholic beverages be as prominently displayed and easy to obtain as alcohol.
3. Prohibit alcohol from being featured in advertising promoting the event.
4. Require trained servers to dispense alcohol, and do not allow a self-serve open bar.
5. Prohibit kegs.
6. Limit the total amount of alcohol to be served at the event, based on the number of people expected to attend; that is, so many beers per person maximum may be purchased by the sponsoring organization.
7. Prohibit drinking contests or drinking games.
8. Maintain strict controls so that underage or intoxicated individuals are not served.
9. Limit the locations for such events (never in dorms, for example, or always at a particular dining hall).

Some colleges have developed systems allowing organizations to sponsor parties if their members have reached a certain level of academic performance. This is an area where creative thinking and cooperation with student and faculty leaders may result in positive solutions.

The National Interfraternity Conference is encouraging its members to adopt a controlled BYOB (bring your own beer) policy for fraternity parties. Legal-age individuals must bring their own—limited—amount of beer to a party. Beverages are checked in at the "bar," and distribution is monitored. Parties are controlled so that invitees may not leave the party, drink outside, and return.

Alcohol advertising and sponsorship: It has been noted earlier that some 35 percent of advertising revenue in college newspapers comes from liquor and beer companies. Local, off-campus bars are advertisers as well. The monetary value of

alcohol-related sponsorship for campus events and athletic programs is difficult to estimate. However, it is contradictory for an institution to announce a broad-based program targeted at reducing alcohol use and then continue to allow all manner of advertising and other promotion of alcohol on campus. Unlike regulating campus events, however, the regulation of advertising and promotion may appear to be counter to free-speech principles so important on the college campus. Boards can consider a variety of approaches to changing the status quo:

1. Outright prohibition of advertising and sponsorship by liquor and beer companies on campus (although the institution's authority may not extend to independent student publications).

2. Involving student groups and campus newspapers in the decision-making process to reduce alcohol promotion. The goal of this approach is to provoke serious thought in the campus community about the effect of such sponsorship, the dependence the community may have on it, and whether this is good or bad for the community. Reaching consensus about reasonable limits for advertising and sponsorship would garner broad support for the policy that is ultimately adopted.

3. Find alternate corporate sources for activity and athletic sponsorships.

4. Prohibit off-campus establishments primarily selling alcohol from advertising on campus radio, bulletin boards, or in the newspaper.

5. Prohibit use of the university logo, crest, seal, or mascot on alcohol products or alcohol-related paraphernalia (beer mugs, shot glasses, and so forth).

Provide alcohol and drug-free alternatives: Because research shows that one reason students drink is boredom, colleges need to look carefully at the options provided to their students for informal, impromptu socializing, particularly during the hours when they are most likely to consider drinking—between 10 p.m. and 2 a.m. If the campus closes down at 11 p.m., the library shuts its doors, the gym is closed, and the snack bar is locked up, students looking for a place to socialize with friends may well end up in local bars and restaurants because these are the only places available to them.

By providing alternatives, the institution can reduce alcohol consumption in a positive fashion—by giving students nonalcoholic alternatives for relaxing and socializing with their peers. This is particularly critical at rural, isolated campuses, where students may be driving some distance to bars, and therefore are at greater risk for alcohol-related accidents. Some alternatives include the following:

1. Consider longer hours for the library and recreational facilities.

2. Provide places for late-night snacks where alcohol is not served.

3. Work with student groups and fraternities and sororities to provide a regular schedule of drug-free social activities, including parties, special events, and intramural sports.

4. Offer a drug-free, alcohol-free residence hall.

5. Work with the local community to provide alcohol-free "pubs" and late-night coffeehouses with entertainment.

Class scheduling: Some universities have experimented with changing class schedules to discourage alcohol use. One school's students had a tradition of partying on Thursday nights, to "start the weekend early." Administration and faculty worked together to schedule classes, tests, and assignments for Friday mornings. Thursday night drinking was cut substantially. Some universities are considering scheduling more Friday classes, and even Saturday morning classes, to shorten the weekend when so much binge drinking occurs.

Reduce the incidence of mixed messages: Consistency of message and continual reinforcement are the hallmarks of effective behavior modification. Changing the campus culture necessitates examining each of its facets to ensure that all members of the university community are sending—and receiving—consistent messages about alcohol use.

University literature, as it is updated or developed anew, should be examined to make sure that alcohol use is not glorified or featured, either in words or pictures.

Rules and regulations for faculty, administration, and alumni consumption on campus should be reviewed to complement regulations applying to students. A double standard will be quickly noted and resented by young people. Faculty and university leaders are role models for students—responsible behavior among such leaders should be encouraged.

University traditions involving alcohol need to be examined and, perhaps, revised. This includes athletic activities, homecoming, alumni, and fraternity/sorority events. Involving all sectors of the university community in developing policies and programs will make changes such as these possible.

Penalties and enforcement: Penalties are another tool for modifying behavior to reduce consumption. Governing boards are encouraged to consider penalties carefully. Are they reasonable, particularly in light of any applicable state and local laws? Are they enforceable? Are they humane? Do they respect the rights of the individual and provide (in appropriate cases) for the opportunity to change? Harsh penalties may have the undesirable result of pushing problems underground and discouraging people in need from seeking help. They may ruin a student's chances to get a college education or destroy a distinguished professor's career.

Obviously, state and federal laws impose certain requirements on the university, particularly where the use of illegal substances is concerned. But in the manner of alcohol, the issues are much less well defined. Working with university experts and administrators, boards should review campus penalties for drunk and disorderly behavior, underage drinking, assisting an underage drinker to obtain alcohol, using false identification, and other violations of campus alcohol policies.

Fines, probation, suspension, required participation in an alcohol or drug-rehabilitation program, and reporting to local authorities are all appropriate penalties—depending upon the situation, the individual, and the campus culture.

Campus security personnel should be trained carefully so they understand how to implement institutional policies and so they treat students and other members of

the community with respect. They need to understand how to recognize the signs of alcohol and drug abuse so they can can act accordingly. Finally, campus and local police should be encouraged to work together so local authorities can support, rather than undermine, campus policies and programs.

Education and Training Programs

Alcohol and drug-education programs provide students with knowledge to make informed choices about use of these substances. They are necessary to inform the student body about the university's alcohol and drug policies. They should also provide students of all ages with behavioral tools—techniques for resisting peer pressure to drink, for helping their friends not to drink, for avoiding risky situations (like riding with a drunk driver), for intervening if a friend has a problem. Faculty and staff training should enable these groups to spot and handle problems—either their colleagues', their students', or their own. Training can also encourage target employee groups to support and contribute to alcohol and drug-prevention efforts.

■ Student Education Programs

Experts in alcohol education have learned that the most successful programs incorporate certain approaches.

These include the following:

1. Programs are interactive in nature, encouraging dialogue and participation;
2. Longer programs (20-30 hours) are more effective than shorter ones (2-20 hours).
3. Using peers as teachers and counselors, programs developed by campus organizations such as BACCHUS (Boost Alcohol Consciousness Concerning the Health of University Students) have proved effective.
4. Programs can incorporate field experiences such as police ride-alongs, visits to treatment centers, and planning and implementing alcohol-awareness activities.
5. Programs for part-time, commuting, and nontraditional students need to be specially designed to fit their lifestyle and concerns. Parking-lot demonstrations, displays erected at highly trafficked areas of the quad, and other attention-getting promotions are necessary to reach students who don't reside on campus.

Particularly useful are programs designed to provide education and support for high-risk groups, especially adult children of alcoholics and identified substance abusers. However, many of these at-risk individuals may first be identified (or encouraged to self-identify) through general education programs.

Education programs should, at minimum, include information on basic facts about alcohol and drugs, risks of use and abuse, techniques for saying no and for helping others to do so, emphasis on the student population as adults responsible for their own behavior and its consequences, university policies and penalties, information on high-risk populations, and places to go for help.

Programs are evolving beyond the traditional freshman orientation course. Some educators believe that students need education to help them develop inter-

personal and critical life skills. Edward H. Hammond, president of Fort Hays State University in Colorado and a respected leader on the issue of alcohol use on campus, has proposed five principles of empowerment to help students become more self-disciplined, motivated, and mature.

1. Faculty should expand the use of two-way dialogue in the learning environment.
2. Incorporate more collaborative projects in academic work.
3. Affirm the status of the student as a full participant in the learning process.
4. Encourage more social interaction between mature and less mature members of the university community.
5. Incorporate the concept of firmness into the educational environment—treating students firmly but with dignity and respect as adults (Hammond, 1991).

To maintain awareness and attempt to change behavior, messages on these subjects constantly need to be repeated and reinforced. Suggestions for even broader exposure include the following:

1. Building alcohol and drug-awareness messages into regular coursework. From English to political science to biology, faculty members can introduce topics relevant to alcohol and drug use and abuse. If such units are built into required core courses, so much the better.
2. Developing a regular schedule of alcohol-free and alcohol-awareness special events. Student groups such as BACCHUS and SADD (Students Against Driving Drunk) specialize in events like these.
3. Designated-driver programs have been popular and successful on college campuses. There is no doubt that such programs save lives. But in the Office for Substance Abuse Prevention's white paper, Eigen points out that these programs imply that it is okay to get drunk as long as you do not drive. Designated-driver programs can help modify one problematic alcohol-related behavior, but they should not be emphasized to the exclusion of other programs that target the actual reduction of consumption.

■ Faculty and Staff Training

Training for faculty and staff can encourage institutionwide participation in alcohol and drug prevention. The American Council on Education has a number of suggestions for successful training and staff-development programs:

1. If the college is beginning a major new program, it should commit to broad-based staff and faculty training as a first step.
2. Deal with real-life situations that staff and faculty face.
3. Training can be delivered through routine staff-development activities.
4. Make the training valuable to staff and faculty members as a part of their professional and personal development.
5. Design a cycle of ongoing training and a protocol for training new staff members.

Focus on staff members most likely to be dealing with these issues. This would include staff in residence life, fraternity/sorority affairs, athletics, student health and counseling, academic advising, campus security, faculty, and everyone who serves alcohol in any official capacity.

Effective training for staff will concentrate on information about alcohol and drugs, including information about their use on a specific campus. Training will cover not only the institution's policies but its long-term goal and strategies to achieve that goal. Staff should leave the course with an understanding of their role in promoting prevention, the knowledge to recognize abuse, and specific methods to encourage troubled individuals to seek help. Specialized training for student health and security professionals will help them quickly recognize and respond to alcohol or drug overdoses or other emergencies.

Assistance and Treatment Programs

The scope and number of treatment programs is growing, consistent with the increasing national concern about campus alcohol and drug problems. Most college campuses have on-campus assistance programs for alcohol or drug-abusing students and employees. Student programs may be managed by a counseling center, a health center, an alcohol/substance-abuse coordinator, or a student-affairs professional. Employee-assistance programs are generally operated by the university or college's personnel office. Institutions that have no services on campus may have resources for referring individuals to other off-campus organizations, including religious groups, self-help groups, and private therapists.

In considering the issue of treatment programs, governing boards should seek to understand how troubled individuals find their way into these programs, how well the programs are advertised and utilized, and whether campus alcohol and drug policies encourage participation—or discourage it—by the messages they send to individuals requiring help.

■ **Getting help to those who need it:** Denial is a common characteristic of individuals suffering from alcohol and/or drug-abuse problems. Those with problems serious enough to cause severe disruption of their work or academic performance—or run-ins with campus or local police—are easy to spot and can be required to participate in some form of student treatment or employee-assistance program. Individuals with less obvious problems should be helped as early as possible, but they may not seek help themselves, nor will they find it if information is not readily available.

Training for intervention: If education programs for students and training programs for faculty and staff include information on the signs of alcohol and drug abuse as well as specific techniques and information to help people intervene, more troubled individuals may be convinced to seek help before their problems go out of control. The campus community needs to understand clearly where individuals can

go for help. The community needs to believe that help will be available, low cost, and confidential. The troubled individual needs to believe that he or she will not be risking an academic or professional career by seeking help.

Disseminating information: College students say they are most likely to go to a friend or counselor or seek printed information if they are in trouble. Students in a series of focus groups conducted by the Office of Substance Abuse Prevention said they would need to receive information about treatment programs in a way that maintained their privacy. They mentioned posters and brochures (placed somewhere that the student would not be noticed picking one up). Campus newspaper ads would be another obvious source of privately delivered information.

Peer counselors: More and more institutions are developing programs that involve students (some of them recovering abusers) as counselors. With some training, these individuals can help others find the right source of assistance. Often, they are more acceptable to students than professional counselors.

Self-help groups: Colleges and universities should encourage self-help groups by providing space and support for these groups on campus. Groups like Alcoholics Anonymous, Adult Children of Alcoholics, and Narcotics Anonymous provide ongoing support for individuals in need. They can provide an extra dimension of treatment and support at little cost to the institution.

Programs for nonabusers: Keep in mind that some individuals will need help and support even if they are not abusers. These include adult children of alcoholics, spouses, friends, or colleagues of abusers, and entering students who are already in recovery from earlier abuse.

Residential units for students in recovery: At the University of Maryland, for example, students in recovery live together in Serenity House, part of an on-campus dorm. They provide help and support for one another in their effort to overcome past dependencies.

■ **Determining the scope and quality of treatment programs:** Treatment programs can be expensive. Governing boards need to define the extent of the university's responsibility for and commitment to providing support and treatment for alcohol and other substance abusers. Federal law requires that colleges and universities inform their students and employees about available treatment programs. But many off-campus treatment programs are overburdened and have waiting lists. If on-campus programs are in place, they must be adequately funded to serve the university community.

Should university programs be open to all or provided only to those in serious trouble? At minimum, colleges and universities should consider employing an alcohol/substance-abuse coordinator who can assess problems and refer people for treatment. This individual should have a background of clinical experience in assessment and intervention and an in-depth understanding of all area treatment facilities, counseling organizations, and self-help groups. This individual (or individuals)

should have the time and ability not only to provide assessment and referrals but to follow up on a student's progress and help him or her return to the university community after completing an off-campus treatment program.

Some universities, particularly those with medical schools, have far more comprehensive programs that provide intervention, treatment, and follow-up right on campus. Specialists in substance abuse work with physicians, nutritionists, exercise physiologists, and psychologists to provide treatment for self-identified substance abusers at the University of Maryland. This on-campus setting allows students to fight their dependencies while continuing their academic careers.

Although most institutions cannot afford to pay for long-term treatment of students, governing boards may want to consider including alcohol and drug treatment in employee-assistance programs or offering employee health-insurance coverage for such programs. Costs for employee programs may seem high in the short run, but it may be more cost effective to rehabilitate employees than to hire and train replacements.

Resources may determine the answers to these difficult questions, but an institution committed to changing the campus culture should incorporate adequate treatment into its overall program. If helped within the university setting, students have a better chance of recovering and going on to be productive citizens. Retaining qualified students, faculty, and staff should be a primary objective of effective treatment programs.

Monitoring and Evaluation

A recent survey of four-year colleges and universities produced some striking results. Although more than 98 percent of the campuses responding said they have some type of alcohol education and prevention efforts, and more than 90 percent said their efforts have increased over the past three years, 75 percent reported no improvement of the alcohol-related problems on their campuses. Thirty percent said their problems have increased! (Anderson and Gadaleto, 1991)

Just having a program clearly is not enough. To be effective, prevention programs need to be monitored and regularly evaluated. They need to be kept at the top of the institutional priority list. These are responsibilities of governing boards, working closely with college administrators. Only with top-level attention and support, maintained over time, will fundamental changes in the college culture be possible.

Setting clearly defined goals and objectives at the inception (or expansion) of new programs and policies will provide the board with the basic tools for evaluation. A comprehensive assessment of the college environment, as discussed earlier in this chapter, will provide data for comparison. Although it is difficult to measure the impact of specific programs or individual policies, colleges and universities should be able to see trends over time that will guide program and policy refinement.

Conducting a campuswide survey (using random-sampling techniques) at the inception of a new policy and then several years later can reveal changes in student

knowledge about and attitudes toward alcohol, as well as behavioral changes. Statistics such as alcohol-related crime, injuries, and vandalism can be compared over time to judge whether any reduction has occurred. Institutions without the expertise or inclination to develop their own surveys can use a questionnaire called the CORE Alcohol and Drug Survey developed by a FIPSE-funded (Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education) consortium of universities (see Appendix B for details).

Qualitative information can be gathered on specific topics or programs by conducting individual interviews with students, faculty, administrators, health professionals, and security personnel. Or focus groups with students, staff, or faculty can be used to determine group opinion on the effectiveness of alcohol-prevention programs and to elicit suggestions for improvement.

Professionals in the university community responsible for administering these programs will have many recommendations for how to measure their effectiveness. Governing board members should keep several factors in mind:

1. Don't expect results right away. It takes time to change any behavior. Alcohol consumption, which is accepted and encouraged by society, is likely to change slowly.

2. Remain interested. Stay informed about progress in implementing new policies and programs. Keep the issue on the agenda.

3. Celebrate small successes. Creative, effective solutions should be recognized and, if they work, expanded.

4. Be willing to change policies or programs to find a better way. Evaluation may show that some programs are less successful than others. Fine-tune, rethink, try something new. Don't abandon commitment to positive goals and programs simply because some aspects of them are not working.

CHAPTER 3
Issues and Concerns for Governing Boards

Governing boards must have a continuing and visible role in defining, shaping, and monitoring an institution's response to alcohol consumption and drug abuse. Whether the institution is setting out to review and expand a current policy or to develop substantial new policies and programs, the board should do the following:

1. Develop comprehensive policies and monitor programs for alcohol and substance abuse prevention and intervention.

2. Budget for the costs of providing education and other prevention programs as well as special services for students, faculty, and staff with chemical dependency or concerns about potential dependency.

3. Establish the institution's role as a leader and a resource for the broader community on substance abuse and collaborate with other institutions and agencies on information and research.

Developing Policies and Programs

The Inter-Association Task Force on Alcohol and Other Substance Abuse Issues, a 14-member coalition of associations representing student leaders and student-affairs administrators, has created a model policy that boards can use as the basis for reevaluating and reformulating existing policies (see Appendix A).

Such a policy can help administrators decide where university responsibility ends and where individual responsibility of students and employees begins. The board should seek a reasonable and realistic balance between the educational mission and the enforcement responsibility of the institution. Although rules and regulations are important and necessary, the reduction of alcohol-related and drug-related problems cannot be achieved solely through the development of rules and regulations. Students, faculty, and staff must be educated about the principles behind the policies.

In fact, gaining the consensus of a broad segment of the university community is fundamental to creating significant changes in perception and behavior, particularly where alcohol is concerned. Governing boards will need the full support and commitment of the college president and key administrators to create a consensus. Alumni, faculty, and student leaders, as well as leaders from the local community, will need to be mobilized for the effort to be truly successful.

Because this need for consensus is so great, boards are encouraged to establish a committee or task force to oversee initial research and policy review and to make recommendations for new policies and programs. Gerardo Gonzales, an expert in campus alcohol-policy development, recommends that the board consider appointing task force members from both the campus and community, including the following:

- the institution's chief student-affairs officer
- chief counsel for the university
- student body president
- editor of the campus newspaper
- campus security personnel
- faculty members (including faculty senate leaders)
- athletic-association personnel
- housing personnel
- campus alcohol/drug coordinator
- health-service personnel
- food-service personnel
- local law-enforcement personnel
- local politician
- news media representative
- Chamber of Commerce representative
- local insurance company representative
- local alcohol distributor

(Gonzales, 1987)

Of course, the task force must be a suitable representation of the university community, so different individuals may be chosen based on the board's (and the president's) judgment of who will best contribute to developing support for substantive policy changes.

The American Council on Education recommends that a task force be given as specific a charge as possible—one that includes policy goals already developed by the board and university administrators. The task force will need solid information about the current campus situation as well as access to expert advice. It will need adequate time, sufficient funds, and staff support to complete its job. Campuswide debate and discussion should be encouraged so that the broadest possible spectrum of participants is involved.

One caveat: The task force should be directed to focus on prevention, education, and intervention. Members should seek the expert advice of legal counsel but should not allow their deliberations to be dominated by questions of legal liability.

A policy with broad, professional authorship carries much more credibility in risk management and legal issues than a policy narrowly formulated to fit only campus administration perspectives and interests. After all the input from various groups has been received and incorporated into the final policy draft, the chair

should forward the task force's recommendation to the university president for approval. The president will then work with the governing board for final approval and adoption of the new policy.

Once approved, the new policy needs to be disseminated to all members of the university community. While federal law requires that the institution's policies be distributed in writing, a broader, collegewide public-relations program involving multiple media—newspapers, workshops, posters, and group presentations—can be the most effective means of ensuring that a substantial proportion of the community is aware of policy changes and the reasons behind them.

■ Special Considerations in Policy Development

Changing the nature of collegiate athletics: Disentangling a college's athletic programs from close association with alcohol use may be a matter of special concern for some institutions. While it will be impossible to eliminate the influence of consistent, highly targeted beverage-industry advertising that associates alcohol and sports in the general media, universities have many options for positive change within the campus environment.

1. Look for alternative corporate support for intramural athletic activities from athletic-shoe manufacturers, sportswear makers, blue-jeans companies, soft-drink manufacturers or distributors, fast-food companies, and airlines.

2. Involve alumni and students in the campuswide effort to reduce alcohol consumption by encouraging them to propose alternative sports-event-related activities—for example, alcohol-free tailgate parties, and other pregame and postgame activities on campus.

3. Direct special education programs toward athletes and athletic staff. These individuals are role models on campus who have a vested interest in maintaining healthy bodies. On some campuses, sport psychologists work with teams and coaches to minimize alcohol and substance abuse among athletes.

4. Prohibit or shorten the hours for the sale of alcoholic beverages during on-campus sports events. If alcohol is sold, make sure all servers are trained to recognize and deal with intoxicated and/or underage drinkers.

This is a potentially divisive issue, involving powerful campus constituencies and, potentially, a lot of money. In finding its way to a reasonable policy approach, the governing board will have to consider the concerns of alumni and sports fans, athletic departments, student groups, and community officials. The amount of money that supports college athletics varies with each institution and may be difficult to replace if sponsorship by alcoholic-beverage companies or sales of alcohol during athletic events are banned. Each institution must reach its own conclusions.

A note about athletes and drugs: Education and training programs directed toward athletes and coaching staffs also need to cover the risks regarding use of performance-enhancing drugs and school policies addressing such use. Many institutions have implemented drug-testing programs for some or all student athletes. Such

programs can raise legal liability issues, however, and should be carefully developed and implemented to protect both the institution and the athletes.

Protecting student and employee rights: Governing boards should ensure that the legal rights of students and university employees are guaranteed. Boards can do this by carefully reviewing enforcement procedures developed to support their alcohol and other substance-abuse policies.

Colleges and universities must respect student and employee privacy rights when developing procedures for compiling information about alcohol and drug use, imposing sanctions, and providing information to law enforcement agencies. In addition, students or employees referred to education or treatment programs as a condition of continued employment or university attendance must be guaranteed that their participation will remain confidential.

The institution should establish fair procedures of reasonable notice and the opportunity for a hearing for students who are subject to sanctions for violations of university standards of conduct. Due-process rights for employees impose similar requirements. Alcoholism is considered a handicap under law, so disciplinary actions should be designed to avoid discrimination. It is an individual's *performance* and *behavior* that give institutions a legitimate interest in discipline, not the diagnosis of alcohol or other drug dependency.

Enforcement must be consistent and evenhanded. At a minimum, the ACE white paper on legal issues suggests that colleges develop enforcement procedures that provide the following:

1. Standards to guide the exercise of disciplinary decision making.
2. Training, adequate review and supervision, and retraining as necessary for employees implementing alcohol and drug policies.
3. Periodic reassessment to identify any problems that might require changes in policies or enforcement procedures.

Institutions serving nontraditional students: Community, junior, and technical colleges as well as four-year institutions with a large proportion of commuter students face special challenges when developing alcohol policies and programs. Because students are more likely to be adults who spend little time on campus, it may be tempting for the institution to relegate the responsibility for aggressive prevention programs to community social-service agencies, rather than allocating precious resources of time and money for programs on campus.

Governing boards of such institutions should look carefully at what alcohol and drug abuse may be costing their colleges in terms of dropouts, property damage, and injuries. They should also consider developing alcohol policies and funding programs consistent with their overall commitment to the communities they serve.

Student-affairs personnel of two-year colleges said in a recent survey that they most wanted information to help them acquire support from their institutions for alcohol and drug-prevention programs (Cornelison, 1992). In another survey, 70 percent of community, junior, and technical colleges reported devoting less than

one-quarter of one person's time to alcohol and other drug efforts. The same survey revealed that 33 percent have no additional funding for alcohol and drug programs besides personnel costs (Anderson and Pressley, 1991).

Colleges serving nontraditional students have the opportunity and responsibility to provide prevention education and support for their students. Programs should take advantage of community resources; work cooperatively with community, county, and state agencies; and provide knowledge and resources for the community. But programs can only be developed with leadership, clearly defined institutional policies and goals, and sufficient funds provided by the governing board and college administration.

Involving the student body: The National Interfraternity Conference, in literature for its member fraternities on the development of alcohol policies, reminds fraternity leaders that "people support what they help create." This concept has proved to be an effective management tool in changing corporate cultures across America to achieve greater productivity and higher quality. It can be a powerful tool for the university as well and is particularly appropriate where students are concerned.

Governing boards should look closely at how students are involved in the process of alcohol policy and program development. Particularly if the university's goal is to change its culture to reduce alcohol use, students need to become a big part of the solution. Otherwise, they will perceive that another set of rules is impinging on their life-style; they may learn more about alcohol and drugs from education programs, but they are less likely to change their behavior.

Boards and administrators may be wary of elevating the profile of the policy-development process in a way that involves much of the community in debate. But involving students in the development of policies and programs that will influence their lives—and those of students to follow—should enliven the process, make it more interesting to the students, and teach them a lesson about public-policy formation they may never forget.

Campuswide coordination: Many colleges and universities already have a variety of policies and programs that would fall under the rubric of "alcohol and other substance abuse." Initial research into the campus situation should include a compilation of these policies and activities. Once a new policy and set of programs has been approved by the board, it is critical that administrators have a structure in place to administer programs and to coordinate with the myriad of university personnel involved in managing activities affected by the new policies.

Staff and financial resources will be needed to coordinate alcohol and drug policies and programs. Messages emphasizing policies and the need for all university personnel to implement them must be reinforced. Generally, governing boards and top administrators must maintain this high profile by regularly monitoring and evaluating of all policies and programs. Policies must remain visible. They must be enforced. Ideally, they will be expanded upon and revised over time to achieve maximum success.

Budgeting for Education, Prevention, and Treatment

Ambitious and promising campus programs too often fail for lack of adequate funding. One series of workshops on alcohol and drug-prevention programs elicited a number of roadblocks to program success. Among them: "lack of dedicated resources, meager coordination and staffing of prevention programs, lack of community-referral resources, and no employee-assistance programs" (CSR, Inc., 1991b).

Funding such activities can present a problem. The institution has many important tasks and limited resources with which to accomplish them. So governing boards must work closely with administrators to set budget priorities that include alcohol and drug prevention and then to develop prevention goals and programs that can be achieved with the available resources.

Colleges and universities already may have activities in place that can be more tightly coordinated to form the basis of expanded prevention and treatment programs. Staff throughout various departments may be managing parts of programs, so administrators should review all existing programs and personnel working on these issues as preliminary research for budget development.

Once current activity levels are established, administrators can reorganize current efforts for greater effectiveness or set new goals. Do adequate staff and resources exist to implement the program the campus needs? Are the resources committed to alcohol and drug-abuse prevention, education, and treatment proportional to the problems these substances cause in the university community? If more funds are needed, where will they come from?

■ **Funding alternatives**

General instructional funds may be a source for alcohol and drug-education programs. Some proportion of education programs can be incorporated into the existing curriculum with faculty support at little or no additional cost. Involving student groups and/or individuals as peer educators is a cost-effective approach as well.

User fees can help pay for recreation facilities and activities, alcohol-free social activities, student health services, and some treatment programs.

Higher fees for on-campus residences could defray the costs of residence-based workshops, education programs, alcohol-free activities, resident-adviser training, production of literature, and posters.

A nominal increase in student activity fees may well be acceptable to students and their parents if it is clearly communicated that these monies will be dedicated to alcohol and drug-prevention programs.

Federal and state grants may be available, particularly for initial program development. The U.S. Department of Education awards FIPSE (Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education) grants on a competitive basis for the development and dissemination of successful alcohol and drug-prevention programs. Funding also is available from the Office for Substance Abuse Prevention (Department of Health and Human Services) and from the National Highway

Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA). See Appendix B for details. State programs need to be investigated by the individual institution.

Colleges and Universities as Leaders, Resources, and Partners

Colleges and universities are already important "citizens" in their home communities. Building on existing town-gown relationships, institutions can work to alter the alcohol environment beyond the boundaries of the campus. A campus that is committed to prevention will succeed best in a prevention-oriented community. In addition, college alcohol policies directed at reducing alcohol use among students may be undermined by members of the local community if they are not encouraged to become part of the effort.

■ **Colleges and universities as leaders**

Governing board members, as leaders in their communities, are in a unique position to foster alliances in pursuit of this goal. Boards can ensure that university officials are taking community concerns into consideration in the development and execution of new alcohol and substance-abuse policies.

Community leaders, working closely with college officials, can be instrumental in orchestrating widespread support for new campus alcohol policies. After all, fewer alcohol-related problems among college students could be a positive development for an entire community.

Local law-enforcement officials need to understand new campus policies. Positive working relationships between local police and campus security are fundamental to achieving effective, humane enforcement of university programs.

Social-service agencies can become a part of campus referral and treatment programs. They can provide the university with an off-campus perspective on community levels of alcohol and drug abuse. Working with on-campus personnel, they can provide expertise for policy and program development.

Local businesses that sell alcohol, including bars, restaurants, supermarkets, and liquor stores, may respond negatively to restrictions on on-campus advertising and other university policies intended to reduce alcohol use among students. Some businesses may actively undermine institutional efforts by winking at dramshop laws, allowing underage and/or intoxicated young people to obtain alcohol. The college or university can take a leadership role in building a community coalition that encourages responsible business practices and strongly enforces dramshop laws.

■ **Colleges and universities as resources**

Colleges and universities can share the results of their policy-making and program-development efforts with the surrounding community and state. Institutions can do the following:

Provide drug and alcohol abuse education programs for elementary and secondary schools and for educators and other health professionals. Programs using college students as peer educators can be particularly successful in the schools.

Offer to provide free server training to bartenders and servers in local restaurants and taverns. A program like this has the potential to reduce alcohol consumption among college students as well as adults who patronize these businesses.

Students and faculty in marketing, business, or advertising courses could develop public-service advertisements for use by local news media about responsible drinking, designated driver, or other successful programs developed on campus. Such messages will be noticed by community residents and campus residents alike.

Institutions providing on-campus treatment programs can share information and program ideas with community-based services to provide counseling and treatment to individuals in need, whether they are on or off campus.

■ **Colleges and universities as partners**

Colleges and universities that share information, research results, and program ideas will enable other schools to put effective programs in place. Governing boards should consider whether their institutions are participating in this exchange of ideas and ensure that such activities are ongoing. A number of organizations have been founded for just this purpose (See Appendix B for addresses and phone numbers):

American College Health Association has a Task Force on Alcohol and Substance Abuse that has prepared standards on substance abuse, misuse, and dependency. It also offers training for campus health professionals on recognizing and handling alcohol and other substance abuse on campus.

BACCHUS of the United States, Inc. is a peer-based alcohol awareness and abuse-prevention organization with chapters on more than 500 U.S. college campuses. Local chapters of BACCHUS and GAMMA (an affiliate organization that works with fraternities and sororities) conduct education programs and responsible (drinking) social events on college campuses across the country. BACCHUS has also developed a special set of materials for use in community college settings.

Inter-Association Task Force on Alcohol and Other Substance Abuse Issues is a coalition of organizations representing student leaders and administrators involved in student-affairs work in higher education. It promotes responsible attitudes and behavior toward drinking, facilitates the development and implementation of campus alcohol-education activities, develops publications for distribution by member organizations, and follows beverage-industry campus-marketing activities.

Network of Colleges and Universities Committed to the Elimination of Drug and Alcohol Abuse. Membership is open to all four-year colleges and universities committed to establishing campus environments free of alcohol and drug abuse. Member organizations may attend the organization's annual National Forum and have access to advisory services and other resources. The network, with some 1,300 member institutions, is sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education.

Forming other alliances: Institutions may consider forming consortia with other area universities and two-year colleges to share information about policies and programs, successes and challenges. Colleges that are part of a state system may participate in or create statewide coalitions with other institutions to share resources.

CHAPTER 4
Guidelines for a Board's Response

Governing board responses to alcohol and other substance abuse on campus will vary widely, depending upon the type of institution, the level of identifiable problems, the function of the governing board, its relationship with university administrators, and numerous other factors. Many institutions are already deep into the reevaluation and planning process. Others may feel no need to change what they already are doing.

At a minimum, governing boards are encouraged to work with administrators to obtain updated information about the frequency and seriousness of alcohol and drug-related problems on campus and then to carefully examine existing policies and programs with the following questions in mind:

1. Do policies and programs go as far as they can go?
2. Do they need to be strengthened?
3. Do they document administrative awareness of concern?
4. Do they include reasonable strategies and sound support systems?

This chapter is arranged to provide straightforward guidelines governing boards can use in whatever way they find most useful.

Getting Started

A. General Guidelines

1. Define the extent and character of the board's participation in decisions about alcohol and other substance-abuse policies and programs. For example, if a campus task force is to be put in place, should a member of the board participate? Which decisions will require board review?

2. Define a mechanism by which the board will receive periodic reports and analyses about alcohol and drug issues on campus. Identify an institutional officer responsible for compiling and providing these reports.

3. Request reports about alcohol and drug-related incidents and controversies on the campus and within the university community. When necessary, make known board support for administrators who have adopted appropriate positions and demonstrated leadership.

4. Require that the institution be in full compliance with federal, state, and local laws regarding the possession, sale, consumption, and distribution of alcohol and other controlled substances; with local, state, federal, and professional standards regarding protection of confidential information; and with any relevant statutes providing protection against discrimination.

B. Assessing the Situation

1. Ask institutional officers to assemble and present information on the character and impact of alcohol and other substance use and abuse on campus. Such a report would ideally contain information about student attitudes toward drinking and drug use; levels of student, faculty, and staff use; consequences of abuse (including dropouts, crime, accidents, illness, vandalism, and racial incidents); and cost to the institution of misuse and abuse.

2. Request an analysis of existing policies and programs concerning alcohol and other substance abuse on campus to determine whether they are currently sufficient or whether they should be reevaluated and expanded, based on the information learned in Step 1.

Developing and Monitoring Policies and Programs

A. Revising and Expanding Alcohol and Drug Policies

1. Working with administrators, determine whether a campuswide task force should be part of the reevaluation process. If so, request that it represent a wide spectrum of constituencies, including faculty, students, and community leaders as well as experts and administrators.

2. Request, revise, and approve new policy goals for the institution to direct the development of recommendations by the task force.

3. Ensure that the task force has copies of the Inter-Association Task Force Model Campus Alcohol Policy Guidelines (Appendix A) to guide its deliberations on alcohol policy.

4. Request that the task force review and make recommendations on overall policy, managing the campus environment, education and other prevention programs, counseling and treatment programs, and penalties and enforcement.

5. Upon completion of the task force's mission, work with administrators to review, revise, and approve the new policy in a timely fashion.

6. Require that policies be consistently applied to students, faculty, and staff.

7. Seek assurance that all policies are realistic and enforceable in a fair and consistent manner. Strict, unenforceable policies may increase institutional liability.

8. Require that the policy be communicated to the university community not only in written form but through an intensive, campuswide public-relations campaign designed to focus awareness and attention of the community on the new policy.

9. Require that the policy be reviewed periodically and revised as needed.

B. Expanding and Monitoring Programs

1. Ask administrators to provide a report and analysis of all existing alcohol and drug-education, prevention, and treatment programs currently in operation. The analysis should determine whether programs are being adequately coordinated or whether a new administrative structure is needed to coordinate and supervise existing and new programs.

2. Require the implementation of an alcohol and drug-education program that

is available and accessible to all students. Encourage student involvement in program development wherever possible.

3. Request reports on the involvement of faculty in alcohol and drug education on campus. Consider expressing board support for faculty participation in alcohol and drug education.

4. Express board support for the development of a wide variety of drug and alcohol awareness programs, including designated-driver programs, special events, alcoholic-free clubs, drug-free residence halls, and expanded recreational facilities.

5. Request reports on the financial implications of alcoholic beverage advertising and promotion on campus, including advertising in the newspaper, on campus broadcast media, and sponsorship of student-organization events. Work with administrators and students to find alternatives for this advertising revenue and to determine whether restrictions on campus advertising should be increased, where possible.

6. Require specially targeted training programs for faculty and staff to help them understand and support new policies, recognize signs of abuse among students and colleagues, and have the tools to encourage troubled individuals to seek help.

7. Seek assurance that any athletic drug-testing programs are operated according to accepted standards and that athletes' rights are being protected.

8. Request a report on current counseling, referral, treatment, or rehabilitation programs on campus (including employee-assistance programs). Learn how well these programs are operating, whether they are well advertised and used, the qualifications of personnel operating them, and how much they cost. Periodically review programs to ensure that they are adequately serving those in need.

9. Require that the institution provide space and some support to recognized self-help groups that provide a valuable alternative for members of the university community.

10. Review existing and proposed penalties for the violation of campus alcohol and drug policies. Seek assurance that individual rights of privacy and due process are protected by enforcement procedures. Seek assurance that campus security personnel and others involved in enforcement are treating all members of the community with humanity and respect. Request periodic reports on enforcement procedures.

11. Establish a regular schedule for evaluating all policies and programs. Use the results of evaluation to improve program effectiveness. Commend successful programs, encourage innovative solutions, keep attention focused on achieving long-term changes in attitudes and behavior.

Budgeting for Education, Prevention, and Treatment

1. Request reports about the current financial commitment of the institution to alcohol and drug prevention, education, and treatment programs.

2. Request information about the financial implications of alcohol and drug abuse on university personnel and property expenses.

3. Ask for comparisons between costs at your institution and those at neighboring and peer campuses.

4. Ask administrators to explore and recommend additional sources of income to pay for expanded or revised alcohol and drug education, prevention, and treatment programs.

5. Seek assurance that adequate resources have been allocated to support the goals, policies, and programs developed by the institution.

The Institution as Leader, Resource, and Partner

A. The institution as leader

1. Recognize and support students, faculty, staff, or administrators who have demonstrated leadership in the institution's response to alcohol and drug abuse.

2. Seek assurance that administrators are working closely with local officials, law-enforcement and social-service agencies, and other community groups to create a prevention-oriented community.

3. Seek assurance that off-campus establishments are not undermining campus policies by selling alcohol to students under age 21 or by making it easy for these students to obtain alcohol.

4. Strongly encourage individual board members and administrators to broaden community support of university policies through their personal connections to the community.

5. Request reports about the work of the institution and its officers and faculty on alcohol and drug-related issues: authorship, research, exemplary teaching, development of model education programs, consulting, testimony for commissions and boards, media appearances, and superior service on campus.

6. Request reports from alumni-relations personnel on the success of informative programs directed toward alumni to encourage their active support of university policies and to elicit spokespersons for the responsible and reduced use of alcohol at alumni events.

B. The institution as resource

1. Encourage creative faculty, staff, and students who have developed model programs, policies, or curriculums to share those products with colleagues regionally and nationally through professional conferences, publications, and press contacts.

2. Encourage administrators involved in alcohol and drug-education programs to share their programs with area public schools and social-service agencies.

3. Encourage students active in alcohol awareness and education to serve as peer educators for area junior and senior high school students.

C. The university as partner

1. Request information about drug and alcohol policies and programs at neighboring institutions.

2. Encourage administrators and faculty to share resources, personnel, space, and programs with colleagues on nearby campuses.

3. Support the institution's participation in important regional and national organizations and in research focusing on alcohol and drug abuse on campus.

References

Anderson, David S. and A.F. Gadaleto, 1991: *The College Alcohol Survey.* George Mason University, Fairfax, Va.

Anderson, David S. and G. Pressley, 1991: *Drug and Alcohol Survey of Community, Technical and Junior Colleges.* George Mason University, Fairfax, Va.

Burns, W.D., E.D. Gulland and V. Rolett. 1988: "Alcohol and Other Substance Abuse: Resources for Institutional Action." *Self-Regulation Initiatives: Resource Documents for Colleges and Universities.* American Council on Education, Washington, D.C.

Cage, M.C. 1992: "Probability That Students Will Drink to Become Intoxicated Found to Rise." *Chronicle of Higher Education.* June 10, 1992.

Chaftez, M.E. 1991: "Public Policy and Board Response." Unpublished paper.

Cornelison, C. 1992: "Community College Needs Assessment." Preliminary findings. BACCHUS Peer Education Network, Denver.

Coughlin, E. and B. Mills-Novoa. 1992: "Drug Prevention Evaluation: Characteristics of Successful Programs in Higher Education." Preliminary findings. Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, Ariz.

CSR, Inc. 1991a: *Faculty Member's Handbook: Strategies for Preventing Alcohol and Other Drug Problems.* DHHS Pub. No. (ADM)91-1843. Office for Substance Abuse Prevention, Rockville, Md.

CSR, Inc. 1991b: *Program Administrator's Handbook: Strategies for Preventing Alcohol and Other Drug Problems.* DHHS Pub. No. (ADM)91-1844. Office for Substance Abuse Prevention, Rockville, Md.

Eigen, L.D. 1991: *Alcohol Practices, Policies and Potentials of American Colleges and Universities.* DHHS Pub. No. (ADM)91-1842. Office for Substance Abuse Prevention, Rockville, Md.

Engs, R.C. and D.J. Hanson. 1987: "College Students' Drinking Patterns and Problems." In Sherwood, ed. 1987, 57-68.

Fenili, M.L. 1987: "Learning, Libation, Liability." In Sherwood, ed. 1987, 19-40.

Fischer, J.M. 1987: "A Historical Perspective: Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism in America and on our Campuses." In Sherwood, ed. 1987, 1-17.

Gibbons, B. 1992: "Alcohol, the Legal Drug." *National Geographic.* 181(February, 1992)2-35.

Gonzales, G.M. 1987: "Alcohol Policy Development: A Necessary Component for a Comprehensive Alcohol Education Program on Campus." In Sherwood, ed. 1987, 87-96.

_____ 1991: "The Educator's Role in the Prevention of Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse Problems on Campus." Unpublished paper.

Goodale, T.G. 1991: "Campus Models for Intervention Strategies." Unpublished paper.

Goodale, T.G., ed. 1986: *Alcohol and the College Student.* Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.

Hammond, E.H. 1991: "The Challenge of the 90s: Development of the New Generation." Unpublished paper.

Sherwood, J.S., ed. 1987: *Alcohol Policies and Practices on College and University Campuses.* Monograph Series Vol. 7. National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, Inc., Washington, D.C.

Steinbach, Sheldon. 1992: *Institutional Liability for Alcohol Consumption: A White Paper.* American Council on Education, Washington, D.C.

Upcraft, M.L. and J.D. Welty. 1990: *A Guide for College Presidents and Governing Boards: Strategies for Eliminating Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse on Campuses.* U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C.

APPENDIX A
Inter-Association Task Force Model Campus Alcohol Policy

The task force recommends that a comprehensive campus policy on alcohol include a summary of state and city laws covering each of the following areas:

1. Drinking Age Laws pertaining to the possession, consumption, and sale of alcoholic beverages as well as penalties for violation of such laws.

2. Regulations of Sale Laws with special emphasis on Alcohol Beverage Control (ABC) Boards' requirements for special permits or licenses by groups that charge admission or dues for events involving alcoholic beverages.

3. Open Container Laws governed by city or county ordinances or state statutes concerning the consumption of alcoholic beverages in outdoor areas or automobiles.

4. Other laws pertinent to the jurisdiction (such as dramshop or implied-consent laws).

College Regulations

In addition to legal responsibilities, the task force recommends that the following regulations be instituted as part of an alcohol policy on campus:

1. Locations where alcoholic beverages are permitted to be possessed, served, and consumed by persons of legal drinking age on the campus should be visibly marked. A specific listing of such places (in private rooms, designated common areas of residence halls, college unions) helps clarify questions that students, faculty, or staff might have about where alcoholic beverages are permitted on campus.

2. Locations where alcoholic beverages are permitted to be sold as opposed to merely served on campus (faculty lounge, college union, pub) should be clearly delineated.

3. Guidelines should be established regarding public and private social events that involve alcoholic beverages within the institution's jurisdiction. An event open to the public (where admission is charged or public announcement is made) should be registered with the appropriate campus office beforehand. Such events should be conducted within the following guidelines:

   a. If the function includes the sale of alcoholic beverages, a permit should be obtained from the appropriate state office or ABC Board.

   b. Individuals sponsoring the event should implement precautionary measures to ensure that alcoholic beverages are not accessible or served to persons under the legal drinking age or to persons who appear intoxicated.

c. At social functions where alcoholic beverages are provided by the sponsoring organization, direct access should be limited to a person(s) designated as the server(s).

d. Consumption of alcoholic beverages should be permitted only within the approved area designated for the event.

e. Nonalcoholic beverages must be available at the same place as the alcoholic beverages and featured as prominently as the alcoholic beverages.

f. A reasonable portion of the budget for the event shall be designated for the purchase of food items.

g. No social event shall include any form of drinking contest in its activities or promotion.

h. Advertisements for any university event at which alcoholic beverages are served shall mention the availability of nonalcoholic beverages as prominently as alcohol. Alcohol should not be used as an inducement to participate in a campus event.

i. Promotional materials, including advertising, for any university event shall not make reference to the amount of alcoholic beverages (such as number of beer kegs) available.

j. Institutionally approved security personnel shall be present at all times during the event.

4. A specific statement concerning the use or nonuse of alcoholic beverages at membership recruitment functions (fraternity/sorority rush, departmental clubs, and special-interest groups) should be an integral part of a comprehensive campus alcohol policy.

5. A specific statement concerning the use or nonuse of alcoholic beverages in athletic facilities or at athletic events should be included as part of a comprehensive campus alcohol policy. Such a statement should apply equally to students, faculty, staff, alumni, and others attending the event.

6. Guidelines for any marketing, advertising, or promotion of alcoholic beverages on campus or at campus events involving alcohol should be stated as part of a comprehensive campus alcohol policy.

7. Procedures for adjudicating violations of the alcohol policy should be articulated. Such procedures should include an explicit statement of sanctions.

APPENDIX B
Resources for More Information

Federal Funding for Prevention Programs

U.S. Department of Education

The Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) provides a variety of funding, usually through competitive, two-year grants, for the development and evaluation of college and university prevention programs. Other grants are available for prevention programs coordinated among colleges and local elementary and secondary schools. For information and specific guidelines, call 202/708-5750.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

The Office of Substance Abuse Prevention has funding for meetings and national conferences for the exchange of information on alcohol and other substance abuse, development of programs for high-risk youth, and community partnership programs. For more information, call 1-800/729-6686.

Sources for Information, Materials and Networking

American College Health Association
15879 Crabbs Branch Way
Rockville, Md. 20855
410/859-1500

ACHA has a Task Force on Alcohol and Substance Abuse that has prepared standards on substance abuse, misuse, and dependency for health professionals. It also offers training for campus health professionals in recognizing and handling alcohol and other substance abuse on campus.

American Council on Education
Office on Self-Regulation Issues
One Dupont Circle
Washington, D.C. 20036-1193
202/939-9420

ACE publishes information to help colleges and universities develop policy on a wide range of issues. Its white paper on legal issues is an excellent resource and can be requested from the Washington, D.C., office.

BACCHUS of the U.S., Inc.
P.O. Box 100430
Denver, Colo. 80250
303/871-3068

BACCHUS is an international collegiate alcohol-awareness and health-education initiative, operated through student-run chapters on more than 500 campuses in the U.S., Canada, and Mexico. BACCHUS promotes healthy lifestyles through advocating informed, independent decision making and respect for state laws and campus policies. Among other activities, BACCHUS is cosponsor of National Collegiate Alcohol Awareness Week. BACCHUS has also developed a special set of materials for use on community college campuses.

CORE Alcohol and Drug Survey

Cheryl Presley
Director, CORE Analysis Project
Wellness Center
Southern Illinois University
Carbondale, Ill. 62901
618/536-4441

Dorothy Smith
University of Minnesota
Office of Measurement Services
2520 Broadway Dr.
Room 130
St. Paul, Minn. 55113
612/626-0006

The CORE Alcohol and Drug Survey is an instrument that will assess the nature, scope, and consequences of drug and alcohol use and policy awareness on college campuses. In addition, the survey was designed to be compatible with other national databases so that direct comparisons are possible. The survey can be used in two-year and four-year institutions. A college or university can either administer, tabulate, and process the survey itself or (for a nominal fee) work with the University of Minnesota and Southern Illinois University for tabulation, analysis, reporting, and comparisons with national data.

Inter-Association Task Force on Campus Alcohol and Other Substance Abuse Issues
c/o BACCHUS of the U.S., Inc.
P.O. Box 100430
Denver, Colo. 80250
303/871-3068

This nonprofit organization is composed of representatives of 16 member associations devoted to promoting education, prevention, research, networking, and national initiatives to help eliminate problems caused by substance abuse on college and university campuses. It is a cosponsor of National Collegiate Alcohol Awareness Week, National Collegiate Drug Awareness Week, conferences, and research grants on alcohol and drug policies and programs.

National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, Inc.
1875 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Suite 418
Washington, D.C. 20009
202/265-7500

NASPA provides materials, information, workshops, and networking for the nation's student-personnel officials on many campus climate issues.

National Clearinghouse for Alcohol and Drug Information
P.O. Box 2345
Rockville, Md. 20852
301/468-2600 or 1-800/729-6686

A public service of the Office of Substance Abuse Prevention (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services), NCADI is the federal resource for alcohol and other drug information. NCADI distributes prevention-education materials, can provide facts and figures on alcohol and other substance abuse, and can conduct database searches or provide referrals.

National Commission Against Drunk Driving
1910 K St., N.W.
Suite 810
Washington, D.C. 20006
202/452-6004

This organization offers a general informational booklet titled "Drunk Driving Countermeasures" and conducts workshops across the country for human-resource personnel and safety administrators through its NETS Program (Network of Employers for Traffic Safety).

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration
NTS-21
400 Seventh St., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20590
1-800/782-1878

NHTSA has developed resource materials and workshops on policies and programs for alcohol and other substance abuse on the college campus, particularly as they relate to traffic safety.

Network of Colleges and Universities Committed to the Elimination of Drug and Alcohol Abuse
Network Coordinator
U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
555 New Jersey Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20208-5644
202/219-2116

Membership is open to all four-year colleges and universities committed to establishing campus environments free of alcohol and drug abuse. Member organizations may attend the organization's annual National Forum and have access to advisory services and other resources. The network, with some 1,300 member institutions, is sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education.

Students Against Driving Drunk (SADD)
P.O. Box 800
Marlboro, Mass. 01752
508/481-3568

SADD operates through student-run chapters and has materials for prevention programs directed toward college-age students. Focus of the organization is to eliminate drunk driving and illegal use of alcohol and drugs through peer-based and community-based programs.

About the Author

Thomas G. Goodale is vice president of student affairs and professor of education at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. A leading advocate for positive campus reform to reduce alcohol and other substance abuse, Goodale is a cofounder of BACCHUS (Boost Alcohol Consciousness Concerning the Health of University Students), a student organization with more than 500 chapters in the United States, Canada, and Mexico. He is also a former president of NASPA (National Association of Student Personnel Administrators) and has published and spoken widely on alcohol and other substance abuse.

ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNING BOARDS OF UNIVERSITIES & COLLEGES

One Dupont Circle
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036
202/296-8400